NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLV.

JUNE, 1886.

SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.

SOCIALISM is a vague expression, used to group together a multiplicity of ideas which have, nevertheless, this in common, that they contemplate the introduction of radical and thorough-going social reforms. Even more than this may be said. Socialism seeks such a reconstruction of society that the entire products of labor shall accrue to the laborer. It would extend the application of St. Paul's injunction—"If a man will not work neither shall he eat"—to all men impartially. Socialism aims, then, not to abolish capital—a folly which no sane man ever contemplated—but it desires to do away forever with a distinct class of capitalists.

Slavery was formely defended because it established the union of capital and labor in the same hands, and Southerners used to argue that only through such a union could domestic peace be permanently preserved. Little heed was then given to these philosophic advocates of slavery, but the Socialist now comes forward and maintains the essential accuracy of their position; arguing, however, that labor and capital must be united in the hands of the working-man and not in the hands of a master. All the instruments of production must become the common property of the toilers, and to them must be transferred the product of labor without deduction of interest, rent and profits. Thus much may perhaps be said of all who are properly called Socialists, whether they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold to anarchy, communism, voluntary coöperation, or state socialism. Socialism thus includes men of peace and revolutionists, advocates of dynamite and preachers of the Gospel of Christ, "the first Socialist," as He is often called.

The term is also applied to some to whom it does not belong in any unqualified sense. Professorial Socialists and Christian Socialists, as a rule, are not believers in any form of pure socialism, though there may be exceptions among them. Usually they are men who simply recognize the social side of man's nature and believe that men can perform certain economic functions in some kind of coöperation more advantageously than in any other manner; who, indeed, go still further and hold that many economic functions can be performed in no other manner. They would, however, often maintain that the performance of these functions was not advocated as an introduction to pure socialism but in order to further industrial initiative and activity in their own proper sphere. It may in general be said of these men that they lay stress on the doctrine of human brotherhood, and repudiate the idea that any human being or any class is exempt from social duties.

The earliest form of socialism to find introduction in America was what might be called village communism; that is, common production on the part of a small group of people and equal distribution of products. Two insignificant trials were made by the Virginians and the Massachusetts Pilgrims, in Jamestown and in New England towns, respectively. These experiments occurred early in the seventeenth century. A more serious attempt to establish the communistic life was made by the Shakers in the latter part of the following century. A small band followed "Mother" Ann Lee from England to this country in 1774, and settled in Watervliet, near Albany, in the year of the American Declaration of Independence. A few years later, they introduced communism as the only form of life befitting those in their religious and spiritual condition. "As, in the institution of the primitive Christian Church, all share one interest in spiritual and temporal blessings, according to individual needs; no rich no poor. The strong bear the infirmities of the weak and all are sustained, promoting each other in Christian fellowship, as one family of brethren and sisters in Christ."

The Shakers have been eminently successful, economically. They started with nothing and now have property valued at several millions; perhaps twelve is a moderate estimate, and it is said that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there has never been a failure among them. Their numbers seem never to have exceeded five thousand, and at present they would fall below that figure. The basis of their communism is celibacy and religion. The Shakers do not claim that their life is adapted to all, but regard it as suited to those choice spirits who wish to lead a higher life in retirement from the distractions of the world. They consider it an advance upon the convents of the Roman Catholics, inasmuch as they do not separate the sexes but live together as brothers and sisters in purity. One of them states their two chief objects somewhat as follows: "We furnish a place to which people can retire who desire to lead a higher life. Our life is a materialization of angelic possibilities. In the second place, it is a notice to the world, an advertisement, calling attention to such possibilities." The life of the Shakers is a progressive one, it must be borne in mind, for they hold that they are to pass through seven cycles, of which the first is scarcely completed. "We are advancing," says their leader, "from winter into spring." They look for a greater future and hold their gates open to welcome all honest men and women, rich and poor alike, who come to them desiring to lead their life. To all such they offer a home.

The Shakers are the most successful example of village communism, though there are several other noteworthy settlements. The Harmonists, at Economy, have amassed enormous wealth, and the Oneida Community, embracing more college-bred men and a larger number of representatives of distinguished families than any other community, accumulated what might be called a competence. Zoar, Ohio, and Amana, Iowa, both of which allow marriage and the family, have acquired wealth. Many communities were established about 1825, and a larger number about 1845, and it was once believed, by their friends, that these communities would spread and absorb all the inhabitants of the civilized world, and indeed of the globe. These hopes have been abandoned, but this early communism still lives and the world has valuable lessons yet to learn from this social experimentation conducted on American soil. If some features of this life could be adopted in the country districts of the United States, it would render rural life more diversified, agreeable and profitable, from every stand-point.

Modern socialism awaits a transformation of economic life on a larger national basis, and looks with comparative indifference on the early American communism just described. Its germs were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought to this country by Germans after the revolution of 1848 in Europe, and since that time German and French emigrants have continued to import into this country the seeds of our present socialism. It grew slowly at first, and did not attain any considerable proportions much before 1878. It is stronger now than it ever has been before in American history.

Organized American socialism must be divided into two general classes: anarchy and state socialism, or socialism proper.

Anarchy is not socialism, in the strict sense of the term, but extreme individualism. Anarchists would abolish all government, for they believe that it is a needless evil. If that is the best government which governs least, then, say they:

> "The very best government of all
> Is that which governs not at all."

The anarchists hold, however, that the absence of authority will produce a natural and spontaneous order, and this order, they think, will be true socialism. Some of them call themselves communistic anarchists, because they believe anarchy and communism to be compatible. It is not easy to understand how the anarchists picture the future to themselves, but it is probable that they think of industry as organized and conducted by unions of artisans, and hold that these unions will be united in federations. Some evidently believe in government and what must amount to a state, although perhaps called by another name. When their ideas are analyzed, it will be found that it is simply the present state-forms to which objection is raised and not the state in itself. This is not true of all, however, for there are anarchists who believe that the social principle in man is a sufficient bond of unity, and will, without force, enable men to carry on coöperative production. It is only necessary in their opinion to abolish all iniquitous laws and institutions, particularly "the beast of private property," in order to allow free course for the naturally good qualities in man.

There have been theoretical anarchists among us from the foundation of the Republic, and a great deal of our early political philosophy was, as some of our present political philosophy, inclined to anarchy. It has been a favorite theory among us that the state is an evil; at best, a necessary evil; and its gradual abolition has been contemplated with satisfaction. Among the abolitionists of slavery there was a faction, led by Garrison, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were peaceful anarchists. A party of anarchists is, however, of recent date. Such a party is the International Working People's Association, with head-quarters at Chicago. This party, as distinct from the state socialists, appeared to have been formally organized in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in the fall of 1883. They then adopted a manifesto, from which the following words are quoted: "What we would achieve is, therefore, plainly and simply: First: Destruction of the existing class-rule by all means, *i. e.* by energetic, relentless, revolutionary and international action. Second: Establishment of a free society based upon coöperative organization of production." As a rule, these internationalists also attack religion and the family in bitter terms, because these are pillars of existing society.

The members of this party regard the existing state as so utterly bad that reform within it is out of the question, and they counsel all adherents of their cause to abstain from the use of the ballot. Like the Russian Nihilists, by whom, indeed, they have been influenced, they believe that it is first of all necessary to destroy what exists, as reconstruction is not possible until our present institutions are completely demolished. Their remedies are gunpowder, petroleum and dynamite, and their cry is "Away with religion, away with the family, away with the state."

The number of adherents of this party can be estimated with difficulty. It has evidently grown rapidly during the past two years, but it may be doubted if its enrolled adherents exceed fifteen thousand. Yet there are doubtless two or three hundred thousand who accept their views. They form one branch of the Central Labor Union of Chicago, in which a large number of workingmen are represented, all of whom are willing to parade with them, and many of whom accept their extreme position. The Federative Union of Metal Workers of America also accept these views, and adherents may be found in other organizations which, as such, do not hold these views, or, indeed, hold quite opposite opinions. The chief danger to the country from this party seems to be this: in time of excitement and restlessness or open revolt, when men in a frenzy of anger are looking about for some one to lead them, those who have been trained in this party may step forward as leaders. At such a time, a few men who believe in violence and destruction, as a matter of principle, may do great damage.

The International Working People's Association has an active

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and energetic press. Among their organs are the "Chicago Alarm" and the daily "Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung." Their Chicago papers claim a circulation of over twenty thousand copies, and they have newspapers in other cities. "Liberty," of Boston, is an advocate of anarchy, though its editor does not belong to this party, and Joseph Labadie advocates anarchy in the "Labor Leaf" of Detroit, although he repudiates the methods of the "Internationalists."

There is another party, composed chiefly of English-speaking laborers, called the "International Workmen's Association" and indicated by the letters I. W. A., not I. W. P. A. or International Working People's Association. The chief strength of this party is between the Mississippi and the Pacific Ocean. It is a secret society and said to be about as strong as the I. W. P. A. It likewise is violent and revolutionary, but its members appear generally to believe in state socialism. The third organized socialistic party is called the "Socialistic Labor Party," which advocates the establishment of state socialism by peaceful means, if possible. It repudiates violence as a means of agitation, but considers the ballot useful for purposes of propaganda. The members of this party seek reform from the existing state, and several of their demands must meet the approval of all right-minded people. Their official organ is the "Sozialist" of New York. The daily "Volkszeitung" of New York, and the daily "Tageblatt" of Philadelphia are widely circulated organs. Their views are presented in Groulund's "Co-öperative Commonwealth."

The number of adherents of the party who are enrolled as members in their sections is small though rapidly increasing. It is doubtful if it is ten thousand. On the other hand, the number of those who accept their economic philosophy is large. A million believers may be a safe guess. Several trades unions are avowedly socialistic in this sense, as, for example, the Journeymen Bakers' Union, the International Furniture Workers' Union and the Cigar Makers' Progressive Union.

These ideas are advocated in some of the labor papers published in English, as, for example, in the New Haven "Workingman's Advocate," and the principles of the Knights of Labor, if carried to their logical outcome, undoubtedly mean socialism. Many thinking "Knights" might perhaps object to this classification somewhat in these words: Yes, our Declaration of Principles un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubtedly means socialism, but, after all, it is not fair to call us Socialists in the ordinary sense of the word. Like John Stuart Mill, we contemplate socialism only as a dim and distant ideal, and not as anything capable of realization in the present.

From socialism, as such, the American people, in the writer's opinion, have nothing to fear. So long as Socialists confine themselves to peaceful methods there is no reason why their right of free speech should be abridged or even feared. It were wiser to seek to learn anything from them, which they have to teach, than to become alarmed. It is the glory of America that she has faith to believe that only such institutions as rest upon sound common sense and approved experience will be supported by the people. It is to be hoped that we will never imitate the disastrous folly of older nations, and attempt the suppression of an idea by physical force.

The only real danger which can threaten the future of our country must proceed from private sin and public wrong. The true patriot, unmoved by frightened and angry denunciation, will close his ears to incendiary utterances, whether they be those of the poor and ignorant who would destroy wealth, or those of the rich and cultured who would shoot down working-men like dogs; for such an one will recognize the fact that righteousness is the only sure foundation for American institutions, and he will endeavor to plant them firmly on that rock.

RICHARD T. ELY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FREE TRADE IN DISCUSSION.

WITH the liberal and considerate judgment born of culture, Professor Sumner, in his entertaining book on the subject, characterizes protectionism as "an arrant piece of economic quackery masquerading under an affectation of learning and philosophy;" as deserving, in his exuberant phrase, "only contempt and scorn, satire and ridicule"—with which, but for its strength in the traditions and the ignorance of people, he would be glad, as a matter of entertainment, to overwhelm its advocates.

That the present paper contains neither learning nor philosophy, the reader will, I fear, all too soon find out for himself; but in order that the courteous Professor may not be annoyed by another masquerade, let me at the outset disavow the assumption of anything but pure scientific ignorance, and only plead that all algebra skirmishes around an unknown quantity and that the solution of the equation is just as absolute as if the coffee or the copper were on the blackboard instead of the x and y which represent them. So may tariff and free trade be the symbols of logic, serving as well for the terms of a syllogism or for the test of fallacy as if one owned a coal-mine, or invented a loom, or left fifteen years of exclusive devotion to political economy in order to explain to "intelligent voters of all degrees of general culture what protectionism is and how it works." The principles on which a reasoner proceeds and the methods which he employs, concern all discussion, irrespective of the thing discussed, so that we may, perhaps, inspect his methods without tapping those reservoirs of "satire and derision" which "remain reserved" for the masqueraders who add hypocrisy to ignorance.

But no sooner has one raised a shelter against this deserved downpour than the *mise en scène* is shifted, and we find it is not the cold chill of satire but the hot blast of "moral indignation"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that threatens us. Protectionism, which, in one paragraph, had merited only "contempt and scorn, satire and ridicule," in the next paragraph arouses the Professor's "moral indignation." The "arrant piece of economic quackery," over which he could hardly stop laughing and be "patient and serious," in the twinkling of an eye becomes "a subtle, cruel, and unjust invasion of rights" which forces him to the front. One cannot help wishing that he had kept to the quackery theory. To begin an economic discussion by scorching one's opponent with "moral indignation," seems a womanish rather than a scientific mode of procedure. If anything might claim to be discussed calmly, it is a purely business question like protectionism. Professor Sumner derides the "sentimental protectionist," yet himself attempts to sentimentalize free trade by classing it with free conscience, free worship, free speech, free press, free soil. But, so far as it can be there, it has always been there. When our nation was founded on freedom, freedom was in them all except for the negro, and he racked the country with convulsive throes till he too was free. The Professor is at his old trick of "smelling pine." The principle of freedom was enthroned a hundred years ago. But when he says: "Trade does not need *any* regulation or restraint," he slyly slips trade out of the class of commerce and conscience and sets it above all social laws. Worship needs restraint; Freeman was incarcerated. Conscience needs restraint; Guiteau was hung. Speech and press are not free to malign. Soil is not free to the trespasser; a man may not dam his own brook to the flooding of his neighbor's field. Our State is founded on the principle that a man has freedom till he reaches the line of another man's right; all dispute is as to where that line ought to be drawn. It is not a question of principle but of fact. When two farmers go to law about a division wall, it is not a matter of free soil; it is a question of where the stone wall should stand. The lawyers do not declaim on the rights of man. They go to the register's office and look up deeds; they go to the probate office and inspect wills. The free-trader admits that government has a right to restrict trade by a tax for revenue, and in so doing he gives up the whole question of unrestricted free trade. He concedes the right to restrict. The only question remaining is, what restriction is wise? In society nothing is absolutely free. Everything is free, subject to the necessities of society. Restriction of trade for revenue is to pay the expenses of the gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment. Restriction for protection is to benefit the people who own, uphold, elect the government. Protectionism does not profess to protect for one man, or for one set of men alone. It professes to protect for the advantage of all. It may be mistaken. It may protect to the disadvantage of some. But that is a matter of detail, not of principle; a matter for investigation, not for denunciation.

Unhappily, Professor Sumner has for this tortoise mode of procedure only contempt. He has "been studying political economy almost exclusively for the last fifteen years," and this miserable matter of petty detail throws it all into confusion. Before it, "the science falls dead on the spot. . . . What can the economist learn or do? What function is there for the university or the school? . . . The only questions which can arise are as to the number, variety, size, and proportion of the taxes. As to these questions, the economist can offer no light. . . . He can deduce no principles, lay down no laws in regard to them. The legislator must go on in the dark, and experiment. If his taxes do not produce the required result, . . . he has to change it. If the result still fails, change it again. Protectionism bars the science of political economy . . . and the only process of the art of statesmanship to which it leads is eternal trial and failure."

This is, undoubtedly, a true indictment against protectionism. For the purposes of the schools and colleges, free trade must be far superior. It easily adapts itself to a formula as incontestable as the multiplication table. In the class-room, major premise, minor premise and conclusion slip into place as easily as the pink and blue countries of a dissected map. Free trade being a simple negation, a man of science can go into his study and lay down laws and deduce principles and make up a scheme of political economy in five minutes, which shall be absolutely perfect, and run to a charm in the classic silence of his library, because unscientific facts are not apt to come in and clog the works. As an intellectual effort or a class-room exercise, free trade is far the more manageable and satisfactory. Compared with its simple requirements, the hand of the legislator is clumsy indeed, who imposes a tax, stands off to regard it, and then tries again, makes no pretense of forming a science, and looks askance at the deduction of principles. Nevertheless, science itself seems to show that, outside college walls, the world and all that is therein were made on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the clumsy legislative "if-at-first-you-don't-succeed-try-try-again" pattern, and not upon the perfected politico-scientific pattern. The protectionists are practicing at the art of statesmanship, just as the Creator of protectionists set the example. The science of political economy—it is saying a good deal, but I venture the suggestion that the science of political economy—lay in the creative mind as clearly as in Professor Sumner's, and that Creative Energy could have evoked humanity in an instant, complete; but, so far as we know, it began with an atom, went on with a plant, still higher with a fish, and higher yet with a bird, and then the protectionist came, slowly corrupting the earth, until the crowning effort defied failure, and the free-trader

> "God-like, erect in native honor, clad
> In naked majesty, seemed Lord of all."

But if the universe could wait uncounted years while Omnipotence was experimenting in our dark, cannot the free-trader wait a little longer for the limited intelligence of sinful man to experiment in the same darkness?

Yet one would not deny that the method of Creative Energy, as manifested in the free-trader, has a certain superiority over the ordinary Divine-historic method. The celerity with which, "led by a study of political economy," Professor Sumner simultaneously settles a country and a question laughs the geologic ages to scorn.

"*Suppose* that a district, A, has two million inhabitants, one million of whom produce a million bushels of wheat, and one million produce a million hundred-weight of iron; and *suppose* that a bushel of wheat exchanges for a hundred-weight of iron: now, by improved transportation and emigration, *suppose* that a new wheat country, B, is opened, and that its people bring wheat to the first district, offering two bushels for a hundred-weight of iron—plainly, they must offer more than one bushel for one hundred-weight, or it is useless for them to come. Now, the people of A, by putting all their labor and capital in iron production, produce two million hundred-weight. They keep one million hundred-weight, and exchange one million hundred-weight of iron for two million bushels of wheat . . . by which they have gained a million bushels of wheat. *Such is the gain of all trade.*"

Certainly, no other merely human Logos has come so near the summary of Genesis: "God *said*, Let there be light and there was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

light." With that swift irresistible *suppose* of Professor Sumner, districts are organized, harvests reaped, manufactures "planted," countries opened, trade established, profits secured, problems solved. Never was an easier emigration than that which sailed down the ink on a facile pen and landed the new nation B beside the old nation A; or a cheaper transportation than that which set the million of B wheat at the doors of the A district, or any "boom" in iron equal to this sudden doubling of price in the B offer to the A folks. It seems, even to Professor Sumner, something of a jump; for he stops the emigration a minute to lift his head and explain: "Plainly they must; . . . or it is useless for them to come!" If they must, of course they do, though it is not easy to see at once the why and wherefore, still, with a hundred per cent. profit in prospect, higher bars than these might be lightly climbed; but, oh! immigrants of A and colonists about to be, thrust in your sickles at Professor Sumner's library windows, for nowhere outside do the waving wheat-fields whiten to so bounteous a harvest! I also am a farmer.

No wonder Professor Sumner has small respect for statistics, and with its Indian wars, its congressional tariff tinkering, its droughts and freshets, its over-production and its labor-strikes, detests the details of a *bona-fide* State, when pure Science, off-hand, can construct a State and a Trade without a hitch and with millions in it. No wonder he cries out with a loud and bitter cry when he sees his pretty little scientific model all jarred out of gear by being ruthlessly trundled off to the factories and fields. He cannot rescue it or keep it from going to pieces, but he can stand at the front gate and forestall failure by shouting: You won't prove anything even if you do rattle it to powder. "Prosperity in a free-trade country, or distress in a protectionist country is fatal to protectionism, while distress in a free-trade country or prosperity in a protectionist country proves nothing against free trade. Hence, the fallacy of all Mr. R. P. Porter's letters is obvious."

And with this, "Heads, I win; tails, you lose" pronunciamento, which we have all heard fizzing from toy guns, but never before saw fired off as a logical canon by a college faculty, the bereaved scientist returns to those "scientific pursuits" which, happily for politics, form his "real occupation."

I have not the pleasure of an acquaintance with Mr. R. P. Porter or his letters, but can hardly help congratulating his surviving

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relatives upon the neatness and dispatch with which his arraignment, indictment, trial, sentence, and execution are accomplished. It is an instantaneous intellectual cremation which scarcely leaves of Mr. R. P. Porter ashes enough to inurn.

But even a political scientist cannot be supposed to sweep away two powerful and almost exhaustive classes of evidence without some reason. Prosperity is the object of all effort. One would say that the relative prosperity of free trade and protection countries is the chief thing to be looked at for testimony. Why is it that prosperity in a free-trade country makes for free trade, but prosperity in a protectionist country does not make for protection? Because, we are assured, the protectionist assumes that if we have free trade "we shall fail of our highest prosperity," while if we have protection, "we can be led up to a higher prosperity." True; but to the intelligent voter of a low degree of general culture it still seems that the relative prosperity of protection and free-trade countries bears directly on that point. To the free-trader, protectionism is the great corrupter and crippler of our country, and simultaneously appears Professor Huxley and announces without further ado that England, the exemplar free-trade country, is also going to the devil, and by a circuitous route. The American professor has been "studying political economy almost exclusively for the last fifteen years," and the profoundest impression produced on his own opinion is that nobody understands it. The English professor has been devoting still more time to study, and arrives at the corresponding conclusion that the English majority is "grossly ignorant of the elements of political science;" yet the majority in America decrees protection, and the majority in England decrees free trade. If protectionism in America is attributable to gross ignorance of political science, why is not free trade in England attributable to the same gross ignorance?

Statesmen suited to the American professor's type of State "have not yet come forward in any great number" under the degrading and corrupting, the grotesque and revolting influences of our sentimental, dogmatic, Philistine, stupid, humbug, invincibly ignorant and dishonest Protectionism; but the English social and natural-science professor puts up his glass to his eye, and, sweeping around the British Parliament, reared upon long years of free-trade principles and practices, asks imperiously: "Have we one real statesman? I see no signs of any."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Misery loves company, and, like Professor Sumner, does not trouble itself "to keep or to throw off scientific or professional dignity." When it is charged that, under protectionism, statesmanship has disappeared, this unhappy country declines to be deprived of the melancholy consolation to be found in telephoning over to its free-trade brother: "Hello! England! you're another!"

The American professor is morally indignant at the "grotesque and revolting" legislation of American protectionists; and the English professor thinks that the English leaders—who are free-traders—are "simply the fastest runners and the loudest squeakers of the herd which is rushing blindly down to its destruction." Why is not the squeak of the English Liberal as disastrous to the logic of free trade as the squeak of the American protectionist to the logic of protection?

It may be suggested, in an aside, that Professor Huxley, who is wide and wonderful in his scope of science, is certainly a little out in his New Testament. He represents his countrymen as a herd of swine "going to the devil;" but if he will refer to the original herd of swine which served for their prototype, he will notice that the devil had come to them. That is why they were on the run. He represents the herd as going to its disreputable goal by "a circuitous method," yet at the same time as "rushing blindly down to its own destruction," or, as St. Matthew has it, literally, "running violently down a steep place." The very point is that they did not go roundabout. If their method had been circuitous, if they had simply rooted their way along, feeding and gruntling, (that is the nearest I can get to *the busy* and contented noise made by pigs at play!) leisurely around the sides of the steep place down to the water by gradual descent, the devil would not have been in them. That is the natural way for pigs to go. *Experto crede.* Believe a farmer. In that case, the water would not have been their destruction, but their life. Let us hope that the great scientist who is worthy of all honor as an apostle of the living God and a devout student of the Old Testament of the rocks, builded better than he knew in this revised version of the New Testament of the gospel. Let us hope that England's most graceful runner and most musical squeaker—the golden-mouthed Gladstone—who once was blind, but who now sees, shall lead a willing herd by a circuitous method; not to be ingulfed in a Red Sea of anarchy, but to drink the life-giving waters of national freedom and lasting peace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may seem a small matter, but I am sure that the learned Professor would be as loath to annoy his ignorant readers by driving his herd awry, as they would be to annoy him by splashing a Triassic atlantosaurus into a Laurentian lake.

Unhappily, Professor Sumner does not confine himself to his first fair representation of the protectionists' pretensions that protection will lead the country to a higher prosperity than will free trade. He represents the protectionist as promising "to make everybody well off," as having a "device for saving the country from hard times," while the free-trader makes no such promise and possesses no such device. The protectionist "is like the doctor who can give us just the pill we need to cleanse our blood," while "the respectable" free-trade physician will not "tell us that he can give us specifics to keep us well." If this were true, if protectionists did promise that everybody should be well off, and that there should be no hard times, then distress in a protectionist country would be fatal to protectionism; but I never heard protectionism make such promises except from a free-trader's mouth. What protectionism holds is exactly what Professor Sumner said at first, viz.: that it held that prosperity will be greater under protection than under free trade. Enthusiastic advocates may sometimes hope greater things than experienced leaders warrant, but a party in church or state is to be judged by its "substance of doctrine," not by its irresponsible extremists. To adopt the professor's own figure, Dr. Fritz advertises under his portrait that he will "Read diseases by the eye of the patient. Daily. Hours 9 to 12 A.M., 1 to 4 and 7 to 9 P.M. No information from the patient—no examination—no previous knowledge of the case. Every ache, pain and symptom described without a single mistake. Heals the sick and deformed without medicine or surgical operation. DON'T let procrastination seal your fate." Yet this does not at all prove that the family doctor is a humbug. He cannot cure hydrophobia, but he may be of great service in pleurisy. *He* never promised to cure you by staring at you, especially if you persist in playing with a mad dog, but he does think that a community which will follow his directions will be less liable to be ill, and will be sooner rid of illness when illness befalls, than if it had rigidly refused all "intelligent assistance;" and vital statistics are very much to his purpose.

The announcement that the most marked effect of fifteen years'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exclusive study of political economy is the conviction that nobody understands the effects of taxation, is to be taken with a mental reservation. For, to the intelligent voter, it is immediately explained that "taxes are crippling, shortening, reducing all the time;" that "all taxation, beyond what is necessary for an economical administration of good government, is either luxurious or wasteful," and that "all the assumptions of protectionists must be abandoned as false." Nobody understands the effects of taxation; but the free-trader understands them enough to know that they are all bad. He cannot tell what they mean, but he knows that what the protectionist thinks they mean is false.

This fable teaches the immense self-satisfaction to be derived from fifteen years of close attention to the facts which make for your own theory, and entire exclusion of those which make for your opponent's theory. It reveals the superiority of a "system to which one is led by a study of political economy," in "school and university," over the patchwork system which one slowly builds up by observing the working facts of experience. It will also be seen that the peach-blow vase which enshrines the ashes of the late lamented Mr. R. P. Porter, is quite large enough to hold the remains of the whole protectionist party after it has passed under Professor Sumner's furnace-blast.

From his fifteen years of exclusive scientific study the American professor has conceived as great a contempt for our national legislators as the English professor has for England's "poor Right Honorable rhetoricians." "We select some of ourselves, who certainly are not the best business men among ourselves, to go to Washington, and then turn around and tax ourselves blindly, or if not blindly, craftily and selfishly. [In which case it is "we" who are foolish rather than the congressmen whom "we" select.] This Congress has *never had, and has never seemed to think that it needed to get, any knowledge of the mode of operation of protective taxes.*"

Yet, two pages before this astounding declaration, the information is given that, in 1882, Congress "appointed a tariff commission which spent several months in collecting evidence." Congress may not have got any information; it may not have known what to do with it after it had got it; it may not have had any to begin with, and there may be no knowledge of taxation in the country except what is contained within the brain cells of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yale College faculty, but the intelligent voter who is sufficiently cultured to read words of more than one syllable knows that what Professor Sumner says on one page contradicts what he says on another page, and deep in the electoral conviction is planted a mustard-seed of mistrust regarding that great political science which is so magnificently unknown.

"An examination of the tariff as a piece of legislation, offers to us nothing but a burden, which must cripple any economic power which we have." Then, with his remarkable facility at forgetting those things which are behind, when he is reaching forth unto those which are before, Professor Sumner maintains that even if this stupid Congress *could* devise a scheme of legislation that should be just right, it would not last a week, because we *grow so fast!* Under this blind, selfish, crafty, grotesque, revolting protection legislation, which "offers us nothing but a burden," which must cripple any economic power we have, which *is* crippling, shortening, reducing, all the time over and over again, "diminishing capital and lowering the average of comfort," we are "fifty-five millions of people on three and a half million square miles of land. *Every day new lines of communication are opened, new discoveries made, new inventions produced, new processes applied.* . . . How . . . could Congress *keep up* with the changes, and re-adaptations which would be required? The notion is preposterous."

Is it a crippled, burdened nation that is leaping ahead every day, so fast and far, that no legislation can keep up with it? The intelligent voter of a very low degree of general culture, would talk thus of a prosperous, energetic, alert and successful nation; and he needs to have it explained to him, that it is only by devoting fifteen years in one's library, to the study of political economy, and leaving out all the trivial little facts of trade, and manufacture, and population, and profit, which make against one's own theory, and make for the humbug and sentimental protectionists, that this Republic can be thus crushed and crippled. By pure science, in his lecture-room, Professor Sumner can ruin his country; but, in the census returns, and on the hills and valleys, the population keeps rolling up and the manufactures keep rolling on. The free-traders' persistent pessimism is like that of the old-fashioned Harlem railroad-president, who long refused to put on a new morning train to New York, and, after he had been forced into it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

groutily justified his refusal and emphasized the folly of his associates, by pointing out that the new train was just as crowded as the old ones! "Take off your foolish taxes," cries the free-trader; "they are crippling the country. And if they were wise taxes, they would not stay on because the country is running so fast!"

To all which one can only exclaim, with the small boy contemplating for the first time his smaller brother, "Funny 'ittle beggar!"

With the clutch of immortal youth, Professor Sumner swoops down upon the protectionists' idea of nationality, or as he, in his mild, philosophical way calls it, "their pretended nationality." This becomes "fatally broken up at the first step," because "economic units are not national units." True; but is it fatal? We tramp over a page or two of assumptions and assertions that it is fatal, and that any other theory is matter for satire and derision; but after all, *is* it fatal?

The economic unit and the national unit, are not the same, but is not the national unit stronger than the economic unit, and, if either is to be sacrificed, ought it not to be the economic rather than the national unit? "Nova Scotia," say satire and derision, "did not join the revolt of our thirteen colonies. Hence, it is thought ruinous to let coal and potatoes come in freely from Nova Scotia. If she had revolted with us, it would have been for the benefit of everybody in this Union, to trade with her as freely as we now trade with Maine." Yes, certainly, because in that case, Nova Scotia would have been bearing her share in the support of our government, in the cost of our post-office, and of the new carpets for Congress, the signal service, and all our coast defenses. Instead of which, she supports Queen Victoria—to whom God give grace of wisdom in her grave and great opportunity—and, if it came to the point, Nova Scotia would attack our defenses instead of strengthening them. That is why we do not give her the advantages of Maine. John offers himself to Jane, and she refuses him. If she had accepted him, he would have paid for her gowns, her house, her food—and good reason for it, because she would have taken care of his mind and manners; but she chose James instead. She cannot expect to have the spending of John's money, for whom she does nothing, as she has of James's money, for whom she does all things. When Jane refused John, he turned to Susan who accepted him. The two families might live together in one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

house more cheaply than they live separately in two houses either of which is large enough for both. Cooking can be as easily done for four as for two, with scarcely more coal, with scarcely more food, but they stubbornly prefer two houses, and all the cost and cumber of two establishments. The economic unit does not coincide with the domestic unit, and, much as man loves money, the domestic unit is the stronger. He sacrifices money to seclusion, to separateness, to the family. "Is this wisdom," asks Professor Sumner, "or is it all pure folly and wrong-headedness?"

Wisdom? A thousand times over, it is wisdom. The family unit is founded on the sacrifice of the economic unit; yet, on the other hand, so marvelous are the ways of the power outside ourselves that makes for righteousness, that this very sacrifice of the economic unit to the domestic unit works to the infinite widening of the scope of economic forces. He that hateth his life shall keep it. It is the Revelation of the Word and the Revelation of History. The rearing of the family takes the chief part of the money that most men earn, yet, by a paradox of Heaven, the wealth of a nation, and even the wealth of a family, is far greater for the rearing of families, than it would be if men refused to rear families, and devoted their lives to themselves alone; nay, more, the satisfactions which wealth secures are vastly increased by wife and children, who are consumers and not producers, yet, who contribute far more by stimulus than they detract by expenditure.

The nation is but a large family. The boundary lines of nations are no more selfish, no more imaginary, than the boundary lines of families. In heaven, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage. In the millenium, the lion and the lamb shall lie down together, and there shall be no cages, or contracts, or customs, or taxes. Until that day, the exclusive and separated family of earth, is the best ideal of, and the best preparation for, the one perfect family, which is the form of the social life of heaven; and the secluded and separate nation, building itself up in prosperity and perfectness, is the best preparation for the time when all the kingdoms of this world shall become the one kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Professor Sumner will not tolerate this Divine method of evolution. He will have the economic unit dominant, yet will act as if the heavenly unit were dominant. He wants the nations to do now just what they would do if the millennium were here. He thinks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade ought now to be perfectly free—just as we all would wish it to be perfectly free, if the world had reached the stage where all men's good is each man's rule. He argues that for one nation not to have free trade until all nations have free trade, is just the same as to say that a man cannot afford to be honest unless everybody is honest. But this is to speak like Job's wife, not like a man of science. It is not the cultivated mind which sees in political opposition personal dishonesty.

It would be nearer things as they are to say no man can afford to trust everything to everybody's unselfishness until everybody is unselfish. I venture to suggest that, in this, Professor Sumner is as rigid as any protectionist. If he owns the house he lives in, he has a deed of it. He does not trust his tenure to the benevolence of the preceding owner. If he owns a share in a bank, he keeps a certificate of ownership. He does not trust the directors to give it to him when he wants it, because it is right. If he has lent a railroad ten thousand dollars, he holds a note for it, and if he has lent money to some Western farmer he holds a mortgage on the farm. This is not being dishonest, but it is not acting as if everybody were unselfish. Professor Sumner does not pull down jails and dismiss the police because honesty is the best policy. Honesty *is* the best policy; still there are many burglars and sneak-thieves, and Professor Sumner locks his doors. Nations are not all of one mind, with all men's good for each man's rule. It is still each man for himself, except as the divine institution of the family has made a man sacrifice himself for the weak of his own family, and for the weakest most, and so has led him gradually into the courtesies, the benevolences of society, and the sense of universal humanity. It is still each nation for itself until, through intense patriotism, each nation is learning respect for the patriotism of other nations; is learning the power of international amenity, the imperativeness of international justice, the solidarity of the nations, and slow and sure comes up the golden year.

"If the man who first sees the truth and first acts wisely did not get a special premium for it, the whole moral order of the universe would have to be changed." It is not necessary for the protectionist to cross swords with the free-trader on his modest little assumption that he is the first discoverer and disciple of truth; or on the womanish assumption that a question of pecuniary and industrial method is a question of morals. Before we reach these we stumble

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the principle which supports them both, and find it contradicted all along the line of history. If spiritual premiums are referred to—the *mens conscia recti*—the principle is right but irrelevant; for free trade or protection is not a question of spiritual reward but of per cent. profits. If material rewards are referred to, the statement is not true. On the contrary, if the man who first sees the truth and first acts wisely got a special premium for it, the whole moral order of the universe would have been different all along from what it has been ever since we knew it. The first and only man who ever saw the whole truth and acted wisely from the beginning died ignominiously on the cross. To see the truth first and to act in accordance with it, has been for ages the signal for martyrdom, until martyrdom has so conquered the blind brute in humanity that he no longer gores—he only roars. We still crucify the seer among thieves, but only in the press and on the tongue—which is a great advance beyond the bloody assizes of old time, and toward the season of the golden year. But no man can establish himself as seer and apostle of the truth by simply calling his peers, his superiors, or his inferiors,—humbugs, hirelings, thieves, robbers. Not with such breezes

> "Fly, happy, happy sails and bear the Press;
> Fly happy with the mission of the Cross;
> Knit land to land, and blowing havenward
> With silks, and fruits, and spices, clear of toll,
> Enrich the markets of the golden year."

GAIL HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDWIN M. STANTON.

II.

History grows more difficult as the world goes on. The art of printing, that is regarded as an aid, is its chief hinderance; for history is putting to record popular beliefs. The daily journals photograph, through their instantaneous process, these beliefs as facts, and, while this process seems to throw a piercing glare on all events, it only confuses the mind of the impartial investigator. It is an electric light that deepens the shadows while it distorts all that it shines upon. The old style, of genius patiently delving among time-stained documents and half-forgotten facts in search of the truth, was more satisfactory; for it made events, if not clear, at least consistent, and, while monsters of goodness and wickedness were created, the mass of facts, as recorded, harmonized with each other. We may not have got a true story, but we did receive a lesson that refined and elevated its pupils.

Through this process, the conduct and character of our great war secretary suffer unjustly. The late Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, and the late Jeremiah S. Black, of Pennsylvania, had a fierce controversy over Stanton's conduct while a member of President Buchanan's cabinet. The one maintained that, if the other was correct in what he asserted, Stanton was a monster of duplicity and ingratitude.

Both were wrong, and, to a certain extent, both were right. Senator Wilson was a man all sentiment and of little information, while Judge Black squared all creation on certain principles, that were as narrow in their bigotry as Wilson in his beliefs. Both failed to take into account the impulsiveness of the secretary, whose feelings often ran away with his better judgment. He was bound, by his position in Buchanan's cabinet, to sustain his chief

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his charming proposition which asserted that, while a state could not secede from the Union, the government could not restrain such secession by force. Stanton saw the absurdity of an attempt to hold the turbulent Union by the rotten ground-rail of a Virginia abstraction, but he looked in wrath that ended in sickening disgust at the noisy abolitionists, who, through their hatred of the master, would scuttle and sink the ship of state. Between these conflicting feelings he gave open expression to his impatience, that Wilson seized on as information, and, after Stanton's death, claimed as evidences of sympathy.

I cannot believe that a man of Stanton's force of character and fixed opinions, was suddenly converted from a pro-slavery democrat to an abolitionist. He was not the man to be stricken down, by one blow, in his sin, and rise in his righteousness. It is my opinion that he took the place tendered him by President Lincoln, precisely as he would have accepted a retainer from a client in an important case. He saw from the beginning that the issue was to be fought out to the bitter end. He found no difficulty in making the case his own. It was his habit; and, in this instance, it came easy; for, while he loathed the anti-slavery organization, he loved the Union with the strongest pulsation of a heart that had in it truer guidance than the loftiest leader of the abolitionists had in the light of his brain.

In the same way, General McClellan hurries into print to charge Edwin M. Stanton with treachery to the man who claims to have made the secretary. This is natural and of easy solution. When the "young Napoleon" graciously consented to the selection of Stanton as secretary of war, he did so under the impression that he was to have the same sort of humble supporter Simon Cameron had been. He awakened to the fact, that it was one thing to have a sympathizing friend in a brother democrat, giving him what lawyers call street opinion on supposable cases, and quite another, to have the same man made master, with the responsibility of an empire thrown upon his shoulders.

Stanton assumed the powers of secretary with the solemn resolve to execute its duties to the best of his ability, without fear, affection or favor. He failed in many instances, as I shall show, but not in respect to McClellan. His first important move grew out of the very intimacy that is made the foundation of this charge. Stanton saw, as did Lincoln, Seward and Chase, that only half

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the enemy was under arms at their front; that the other half, far more deadly, was coiled in silence at their rear.

Lincoln was a minority President. The unknown rail-splitter of Illinois had no hold on the affections of the people he presided over. He told us once that he felt like a surveyor in the wild woods of the West, who, while looking for a corner, kept an eye over his shoulder for an Indian. The late Whigs and immediate free-soilers voting against the extension of slavery, more from the necessity of having some sort of a platform on which to rally than opposition to slavery, accepted without enthusiasm the President a minority had elected; while the democrats at the North felt, as deeply as Stanton himself, nothing but hatred and contempt for the cause.

The firing on our flag at Sumter, that so aroused the war spirit at the North, had disconcerted and discouraged the democratic sentiment at the same North, but did not kill it. It was observed and it must be remembered, that, as the thousands wheeled into line and marched to the front, it was under cries of "Save the Union," and not to free the negro. They went out to punish and put down the miscreants who had dragged in the dust the flag of our fathers, and they gave the abolitionists the cold shoulder for being, as they believed, the real cause of all this turmoil. How long this war spirit would last was the question. Lincoln believed it would continue with his success in the field. He and his cabinet suddenly awakened to quite another fact, and that was that, while a victory seemed to arouse the rebel spirit at the North, and a demand was heard to cease fighting and negotiate with the wrong-doers for peace, a shameful defeat, that sent mourning through the households of the patriotic, seemed to arouse a spirit that not only silenced open discontent, but sent thousands on thousands of brave fellows to the field to retrieve the disaster.

It was impossible to tell how long this state of affairs would continue. Our great statesmen in control at Washington well knew that this rebellious discontent grew on delay. Hence Stanton's demand, "We will have some fighting, gentlemen."

He awakened to another startling fact, and that was that this spirit of distrust in the government had crept into the army. West Point, that teaches everything but patriotism and the art of war, had been prolific of pro-slavery democrats. Taught blind obedience to the powers that be as the essence of soldiership, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

having known no other power than a pro-slavery government, the West Pointers divided at the sound of the first gun, and while one half, acknowledging allegiance only to their States, went South, the other half, recognizing their obligations to the National government, remained faithful, and yet, with few exceptions, secretly despising the rule of abolitionists. This feeling arose from the additional fact that West Point is more of a social feature than a military school, and as reformers are not fashionable, seldom, if ever, even respectable, the cadet had a horror of the howling abolitionist.

These are unpleasant things to say now, but I am giving Stanton's views at the time, and the views shared by his eminent associates. We look back and wonder at the cold neglect awarded George H. Thomas, the most brilliant and most successful soldier of the war, but Lincoln had been taught to distrust a West Point democrat and that distrust was deepened by Thomas's Virginia birth.

"This man has no heart in the cause," said Stanton of McClellan, "he is fighting for a boundary if he fights at all; our great difficulty is to make him fight at all."

I have not the space here to follow the young Napoleon through his fearful disasters on the James. Stanton maintained to the last hour of his life that these defeats came as much from disloyalty as incapacity. I differ from him. The same lack of capacity that brought defeat saved us from any well-defined project of treachery. The man who shrunk from a move on Richmond after Malvern Hill, had not in him the stuff to make a Catiline.

I have nothing to do with the war, save so far as the facts go to disprove the charges now made against the dead secretary. Stanton told me after he left the War Department to die, that "all the time the huge army lay coiled about Washington, a distrust of the government at Washington, as a nest of vicious abolitionists, was insidiously cultivated among the men; and, after the terrible defeats before Richmond, when distress from sickness and disaster depressed the army, the men were taught to believe that the government had abandoned them to their cruel fate. This was so marked," continued the secretary, speaking in gasps, "that when Lincoln visited the camps a fear was had at headquarters that he would be insulted, and orders were issued to cheer the President when he appeared. Instead of holding to all that we had gained through such terrible loss of blood and money, the entire army had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be returned to the fortifications of Washington, before Lincoln dared put another general in command. McClellan's restoration was a mistake, but it originated in the same fact. Lincoln said: 'This man may not be the best to continue as our general, but he has the confidence of the men and is the only one able to reorganize our forces after these defeats. We must bear with him a while longer.'"

I have not space to treat of this McClellan affair further than is necessary to illustrate the character of Secretary Stanton. If the democratic general had his plan of a campaign, he was as remarkable for keeping it to himself as he was cautious in putting it in operation. Nothing but repeated orders could force him to move, and the only interference he could complain of was in the directing that Washington should not be uncovered.

The true story of the late war has not been told. It probably never will be told. It is not flattering to our people, and, as I have said, unpalatable truths seldom find their way into history. All books, so far, are confined to the armed conflict, which was but one-third of the war the administration was called on to prosecute. I have referred to the disloyal feeling that fairly honeycombed with treason the Northern States. There was another third of the conflict that concerned the power at Washington that the able Seward, under Lincoln, managed with eminent ability, and that was the danger from foreign interference. Had the war powers of Europe combined, as they were disposed to do, in a recognition of the Confederacy, I would now be writing this under the Northern Republic of America. This fear was never made prominent, for it was not policy to have it known, but it hung on the horizon like a heavy cloud, with muttering thunder, that Lincoln and his cabinet were forced to see and hear.

Now, our capital was in the country of the enemy. Sandwiched between Virginia and Maryland, with treason simmering in the one and at a boil in the other, it was in continual peril. To lose that capital at any time, was to fetch on from Europe not only recognition but armed interference. The clear, capable brain of Seward saw this, and hence the order from the secretary of war that kept an army well in hand, not so much to repel the attacks of an organized force, as to keep in subjection a people whose stones and clubs would have been as much to the purpose as Lee's armed brigades of disciplined men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am pained to write, striving to do so with truth, that against other charges of injustice on the part of the great secretary I can make no defense. With all his eminent ability, with all his earnest, honest desire to do his duty for the government he served, he was, without exception, more subject to personal likes and dislikes, more vindictive in his gratification of the last, than any man ever called to public station. Nothing but his wonderful ability and great force of character saved him and his cause from utter wreck in this direction. Not only so, but it seemed to me that both Stanton and Seward were drunk with the lust of power. They fairly rioted in its enjoyment. While Lincoln and Chase were as pure and simple in this as children, with no such morbid desire to gratify, with no personal friends to favor, and no enemies to punish, Stanton and Seward not only reveled in despotic authority, but Stanton used the fearful power of the government to crush those he hated, as he sought through the same means to elevate those he loved.

Of the many instances memory brings to mind, the most cruel, one may indeed write infamous, was that awarded General Rosecrans. William S. Rasecrans, a brave, patriotic soldier, with brilliant qualities as a commander, and many striking defects, had wounded Stanton in a way never to be forgotten or forgiven.

"Old Rosy," as his soldiers affectionately called him, and, in so doing, gave the man in two words, did not know one man from another. In regard to character he was color blind, and, of course, did not recognize a great man when he saw him—certainly not, unless under epaulettes manufactured at West Point. He regarded Stanton as a clerk to the President, and the President as an impertinent interference in the management of the great war, which interference he regretted that the Constitution prevented removing.

I have said he had brilliant qualities as a general in command. He could plan a campaign and fight a battle equal to any officer in the United States. But in the selection of his subordinates he could not distinguish George H. Thomas from Alexander McDowel McCook, and in receiving instructions or advice from his superiors he could not see that they were apt to be wiser than he, from their having escaped what he was pleased to call a military education. In the personal intercourse first had between the secretary and the soldier occurred a mutual misunderstanding of each other that continued to the end. Nature has given to all its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creatures an instinctive knowledge of their enemies. This enmity really had its origin in ignorance, but it is doubtful whether any amount of information would have corrected the difference. Rosecrans saw before him, as I have said, a mere clerk, and instead of sweeping the floor with his new plumes, with bated breath and humble attention, as other generals were wont to do, he not only held his perpendicular with the martial bearing becoming the sashed and gold-embroidered soldier, but with a soldier's indifference to the views of a clerk and civilian on matters of war. Of course, the secretary resented such extraordinary conduct and could see no good in the shallow brigadier.

A vacancy of a major-generalship in the regular service occurring some time after Stanton assumed the duties of secretary, he issued a circular to all the generals open to such promotion, offering the position to the one achieving the first victory.

The secretary did not entertain the highest opinion of his epauletted subordinates, and did not know that he was wounding men who, whatever may be said of their military capacity or patriotism, had, through training and association, a nice sense of honor. All of these felt what Rosecrans alone had boldness enough to resent. Seizing his pen, always as fatal to himself as his sword to the enemy, he worded a rough rebuke that went home to the heart of the author of the circular. After that this brave man and efficient officer had, first, neglect, and then cruel punishment and abuse from the secretary.

When the Army of the Cumberland required a new commander after the failure of General Buell, Chase urged Rosecrans, and Lincoln called him to the place, in spite of Stanton's opposition. The secretary of war preferred Thomas, not only because he had learned to admire and believe in that greatest of all our generals, but for that he had sworn "Rosy" should never again be officer of his. I speak of what I know, for I had excited Stanton's wrath by urging the selection of Rosecrans, and I remember well the day when he entered the war department, flushed with anger, for I happened there, and said, abruptly to me, "Well, you have your choice of idiots; now look out for frightful disasters."

No army in the field called for the same patient consideration and care as that of the Cumberland. The success of our campaigning turned on a question of transportation. The enemy occupying the inner line of a circle, could, with comparative ease, concentrate on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any point selected, while to the geographical difficulties before us, were added the dishonesty of our agents furnishing supplies and the wanton improvidence of our men, who, feeling the huge government at their back, were, with all their courage and endurance, as improvident as children. We wasted in a day what would have sustained an European army for a month.

We had three armies in the field, and if my reader will turn to the map, he will see that, while one operated on the James, the other had the Mississippi. The third, Rosecrans's force, struck through the interior from Louisville, and for six hundred miles over the enemy's territory had to depend on a single line of railroad. Rosecrans had more trouble to keep open this line, and after every victory and successful turn, to accumulate supplies, than he had to whip the enemy. The two armies, right and left of him, moved on with ease, and while their generals were congratulated on their maneuvers, Rosecrans was censured for delay, although at every halt he won a victory and rebuilt his railroad. His objective point was Chattanooga, the Gibraltar of the South. Nature built the impregnable fortifications of the place, while almost impassable mountains stretched their palisades east and west for two hundred miles.

Rosecrans, after delays Stanton would not appreciate, and the people grew impatient over, penetrated these mountains, turned Bragg's flank, and forcing the Confederate to a fight on equal terms, repulsed him and fell back on Chattanooga. He had accomplished his objective point. He had won the apparently impregnable fort, from which our armies operated from that out, and his reward was, under a cloud of lies, to be dismissed in the most insulting and brutal manner. This was so evident, that Thomas, who had won our victory at Chicamauga from the very jaws of defeat, repudiated the call made on him to succeed Rosecrans, and only accepted, when forced, after he had put on record his high appreciation of his late commander.

Stanton had his defects, but he had no weaknesses. His very sins had a fierce strength in them, that helped on, instead of retarding his work. He could crush a personal enemy under the iron heel of his military power, but the men he favored, such as Hooker, Pope and Thomas, were eminently fitted for the tasks assigned them.

Stanton's was the master mind of the war. To his indomitable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will and iron nature we owe all that we accomplished in that direction. When he saw, after the battle of Gettysburg, that the Confederacy was sinking from sheer exhaustion, he crowded on men to stamp it out. He knew that Lee was leaving a highway of human bones to mark Grant's road from the Rapidan to Richmond; that we were having more killed than the Confederate generals had in command; he knew that Sherman's march on Atlanta was a succession of bloody defeats, and he said, "He can give five men to their one, and win; these victories to the rebels are disasters they cannot afford." He knew that forty thousand of our poor fellows were dying of exposure and starvation in Confederate prisons, yet when Grant wrote him that to liberate that number of healthy rebels would be the ruin of Sherman, the exchange was stopped. There was no sea of blood, no waste of treasure, to stand in the way of a restored Union and the empire of a continent.

He finished his great work, resigned his commission of office and life at the same instant, for he staggered from his Department on the arm of Death. The terrible strain that a fierce nature had actually lived on, gave way, and the relaxation meant dissolution. The silver cord did not snap; it unraveled and fell to pieces. He died in the golden glow of his greatness, and was spared that most pitiable of all spectacles, the hero who survives himself. It was a cold, stormy night, when this stormy nature sank to its last repose, and the Carnot "who organized victory" surrendered quietly to the victor of all.

As the smoke of battles and the mist of conflicting passions pass away, five grand, stern figures loom up before us, standing strange and solemn as fates raised by destiny to save our Government in its hour of peril. The monument to Lincoln has not yet been built. When it is, the column that holds aloft the form of our greatest man of that trying period, should have supporting the base, four bronze figures of Chase, Seward, Stanton and Thomas. And so will history, in the hearts of the people, group those to whom we owe our existence as a Nation.

DONN PIATT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY AM I A PRESBYTERIAN?

THE writer hesitated about undertaking a reply to the above question in a Review, not from any indefiniteness of opinion, or weakness of conviction, but from some sense of the responsibility incurred. In the United States and Great Britain alone, there are seventeen or eighteen thousand congregations, at least, adhering to Presbyterianism. This does not include the Continent of Europe, the wide field of missions, nor the Australian Colonies. Men's minds reach the same practical results by different roads, and it is easy to see how some one might say: "I am a Presbyterian, but not for these reasons. This answer does not represent me." He would be a bold man who would try to formulate an answer to the question, "Why am I a Democrat?" or "Why am I a Republican?" with the confidence that all the adherents of these parties, respectively, would feel that just their convictions had been clearly stated. The caution, then, is proper that no one is committed to the arguments to be presented but the writer; and if any reader can make the case clearer or stronger to himself, or, in fitting ways to the world, the writer will be among the first to "accept the amendments."

One other preliminary statement it is proper to make. The question "Why am I a Unitarian?" has been answered in these pages. The answer involves the discussion of vital doctrines, and, strictly speaking, of nothing but doctrines, for one might be a Unitarian and hold by a Congregational, a Presbyterian, or a prelatic organization. I know, in fact, a small body of Unitarians who hold by Presbyterian government. Now a casual reader may expect a second discussion of doctrines in reply to our question. But a little thought will modify that expectation. Presbyterianism is a form of church government, and as such it is here presented. It does not, as a term, touch the question of theological beliefs as they are summed up, for example, in the Westminster

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standards, or the Thirty-nine Articles. It deals with organization and methods of administration. That there are affinities between doctrines believed and the ways in which their believers shape their common organizations is admissible; but we are not necessarily led, in answering the question, to minute details. Without tiring the patience of the readers, and without assuming that busy men and women have time for all the minute details of historical and denominational discussions, it will be the aim of the writer to show the main reasons why we hold by Presbyterianism.

A statement of the theory of Presbyterianism is proper in the first instance. This will naturally lead to the grounds on which the theory is rested. A reference to some of the ways in which Presbyterianism is differentiated from other forms of church organization, it is hoped, will bring into clearer light its characteristics and conclude the article.

The fundamental idea of Presbyterianism is that in the New Testament, the one guide-book, all ministers stand on the same level, as distinguished from the "orders" and grades that sprung up in the progress of the ages, and that they have no one over them such as a diocesan bishop. In a body of believers, one of their number, believed to be qualified by gifts and graces to edify his brethren, chosen by them, and duly recognized, is a New Testament minister. A group of such bodies of believers, or churches associated together, for the sake of order, mutual edification and increase of spiritual strength, must needs arrange methods of mutual recognition and common operation. If gathered together by outside leaders, such as missionaries or evangelists, they would avail themselves of their moral weight and aid in the settlement of ministers and the adoption of rules of joint action; but the ministers once recognized have no human superior in office. They are subject to one another as in the very nature of society of any sort; but there is no ruler or governor between them and the "Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls."

Then is the minister, or pastor, the autocratic ruler of the congregation over which he "presides?" No. Presbyterianism includes the representation of the people by a body of men chosen by themselves, and called "elders." It anticipates the free form of modern civil government. Of these elders the pastor is one for administrative ends. Just as the directors of a bank, finding all the time of a man needed for the conduct of its affairs, will select one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and enable him to live without other business while they are joined with him in management, so an elder with gifts and graces, is put in a position to "give himself wholly" to the ministry, while the body of elders—he being one of them—has in hand the governing of the local community. All rule; some are fitted especially to teach and assigned to that duty. When the "church" includes a number of congregations, that they should be associated together for common ends is natural. So it is the natural outgrowth of the common life that men should be trained for the teaching, just as young men are trained for banking. When a region is occupied by such Christian communities, meetings become a part of the common life, and rules and regulations follow as in any other form of social co-operation. Here the elders, ruling and teaching, constitute the natural representatives. If a statement of common belief has to be framed as a testimony to man; if rules are to be framed for carrying out the ends of the Church; if they are to be maintained and enforced, the assembled elders, representing the company of believers, and with no power above them, civil or ecclesiastical, constitute the court. These details are not set forth in form in the Scripture, just as the doctrines of the Christian system are not formulated in Scripture as in a creed. They are the outcome of Scriptural principles applied to a Christian community, just as courts of law are the outcome of right principles applied to civil life, and as an elective judiciary supersedes the "chief" of savagism or the despot of the Orient. Strictly speaking, any body of elders is a Presbytery. So the Protestant German brethren (among whom the elements of Presbyterianism have been accepted since September, 1873) call our "Session" a Presbytery or body of elders, and our "Presbytery" a local Synod. It is not meant that the details of so many synods or general assemblies are set down in Scripture. These are matters for Christian discretion. To say this is to concede nothing to outsiders. No pleader for the divine origin of prelatic government, (we use this phrase to avoid confusion, for, as will be seen, we claim episcopal government,) would claim to find the size and number of the dioceses prescribed in Scripture. All the "elders," or "presbyters" are "bishops:" all rule. Some labor in the word and teaching.

Do "elders" include all the officers in a congregation of the Presbyterian order? No. We have "bishops and deacons,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as had the church at Philippi (Phil. i. 1). Any organization must have questions of means, of accommodation, of poor members, of the care of them, to be attended to. These are not purely spiritual matters. They are the common affairs of a spiritual body, just as the bank account, store, dwelling and expenses of a Christian man are his common matters. These he has in common with all other men; but he is expected to manage them in a Christian way. So a church has buildings, means, claims, obligations in common with other forms of organized society; but it is expected to manage them in consistency with its distinctive character. This is the function of the "deacons." United States' law has made a body of "trustees" necessary to the holding of congregational property in some quarters, and in Great Britain, elected officers perform this, and other diaconal functions, without bearing the precise name, although in this regard more exact language is now coming into use. Presbyterians, taking the rules given by the Apostle Paul to Timothy as their guides in this matter, do not look for teaching or preaching from these deacons. (See 1 Tim. iii. 8–10.) The elders or bishops must be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. iii. 2), "able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers" (Tit. i. 9). There is no such requirement regarding the deacons. It is even conceivable that Christian communities may be so placed as not to need these as ministers, bishops, or elders are needed. Hence one does not wonder that Titus has no directions given him on this matter.

These, then, are the principles of government and the two classes of officers of Presbyterianism. Moderators are no more permanent officers than are the chairmen of public meetings. Disorderly members are judged by officers chosen by the membership; officers are tried, if disorderly, by their peers, just as a lawyer, discrediting his profession, is tried by "members of the bar," vindicated if innocent, disbarred if guilty.

It is needless to say that Presbyterians have no place for *a* pope, or for *the* Pope. They have no place for an archbishop, or a prelate of any kind. Ministers in a Church of over six thousand congregations may differ in gifts, experience, influence, and the like, but the vote of the pastor or the ruling elder of the smallest congregation in Dakota is of equal value with that of any of his brethren. The parity of the ministry, the adequate representation of the people, the privilege and responsibility of choosing their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

officers—these are the leading elements in Presbyterianism, resting as we believe on principles enjoined in Scripture, historically traceable, and working on the whole as well as the best principles do when intrusted to human hands. Presbyterianism is not without constituted authority. It seeks elders that "rule well," and it calls on its people to "obey them that are over them in the Lord." It has its "orders"—bishops, or presbyters, and deacons. It owns Christ as the sole Ruler and Legislator, and it traces to His gift apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, for the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ. In this list of servants it sees no room for a prelate. In accordance with the radical idea of the Reformation, we hold the Scriptures to be the rule in this matter. Hence to show that early "Fathers" or councils did so and so does not touch our position. We try to move along the lines laid down, in directions and in practice, in the word of God.

It is now proper to pass on to a concise statement of the grounds on which the Presbyterian theory rests. Again I venture to recall the form of the question, "Why am I a Presbyterian?" It may be allowable to state the reasons as they seem to have weight with the respondent, though others might, with conclusions no less strong, arrange them differently. The following statement of the form of Church government from which, among Protestant churches, Presbyterianism is most widely parted, will show how they are called for. "The ministry is divided into three orders: 1. Bishops; 2. Priests; 3. Deacons. The priests at first were called Bishops and Elders. After the Apostles died, as there were no more Apostles, the name Bishop was confined to the first order which took the Apostles' place. Timothy and Titus were such Bishops. Bishops consecrate their successors in the Episcopate; ordain the Lower Orders of the Clergy; confirm the baptized and preside in the Councils of the Church." This is the exact language, even to the capitals, of a prelatic Catechism in use and on sale in New York. It is easier to transcribe than to understand it. Now, in the first place, I find no such arrangement in the New Testament as officers taking the apostles' place; no such officers as "priests;" no subordination of those called "elders" and "bishops" to bishops who took the apostles' places. But the New Testament is the one authority. We do not go to the Fathers for doctrine nor for Church government. The sufficiency of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scripture is maintained. We hold that if men will only go far enough down with "the Fathers" they must accept the elements of papal organization and doctrine. We hold to the word, and we see in it no order of men superior to those called "bishops and elders." One of the later writers on "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," Hatch (Bampton Lecture, for 1880), argues that the body of officers in the early Christian communities were known individually and collectively as *presbuteroi* (we put the Greek into English), and he adds, "they were also known—for I shall here assume what the weight of evidence has rendered practically indisputable—by the name *episcopoi*" (p. 38). Not one word or suggestion has Mr. Hatch—a zealous and able advocate for prelacy as a development in post-apostolic times—to produce for any officer provided for *in the New Testament* superior to the elders or presbyters. Of course he can show that, later, the diocesan rose above them, just as the Roman Catholic can show that, later, the Bishop of Rome came to the headship of the Church. We believe there is no place and no provision for them in the New Testament. He shows "the causes which led to that great change in Christian organization by which the functions of this original plurality of probably co-ordinate officers came practically to pass into the hands of a single officer" (p. 39). We are for keeping things as they were before this passage, just as Protestantism is for keeping things as they were before the development of the papacy. His history begins with Justin Martyr, and indicates that the elder who received and distributed the gifts for the poor came to be called *episcopos*. Whether his argument is weak or strong is not the point. That he makes it at all is evidence that a most learned advocate of prelacy with all the advantages of scholarship up to 1880 has to admit that the superior to the *presbuteroi* is a development of post-apostolic times, is not apostolic, and has no basis in the New Testament. The space at our disposal does not admit of much more that might be said on this matter.

2. Without detailing the process, or wearying the reader with ancient words, we proceed to say, in the second place, that there was a historical preparation for Presbyterianism in the Apostolic Church. The Hebrews had a tribe of priests and Levites in which office was hereditary. But there were frequent apostasies under this priesthood. Captivity and dispersion of the people followed. To reprove the apostates and to revive religion prophets and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teachers came in. Congregations of Jews came to be formed in the great cities of the East and the West. They carried the elders of their earliest times with them. Teachers thus came to supersede priests, whose functions implied the temple at Jerusalem, and the Church was prepared for the abandonment of the priestly order and the setting up of the teachers. No one pretends that the hereditary priesthood of Judaism is continued. So in God's providence, which takes in all time and all lands, the existence of Hebrew congregations, with boards of elders governing the members, prepared for the Christian congregations with the like governing body. So Mr. Hatch expends much learning in proving that Jews, when they became Christians, had "a governing body of elders" in each community (p. 58), and no "change was needed in the organization" (p. 59). He spends much learning in tracing the process by which Gentile churches also came to have "government by a council or committee," all but universally, but spontaneously. "The Christian council of presbyters" exercised discipline, and "exercised a consensual jurisdiction in matters of dispute between Christian and Christian" (pp. 68–71). What is thus with much erudition made out by Hatch we accept from the New Testament. From Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus for the elders of the Church (Acts, xx. 17), and in a most solemn charge and warning against dangers he never once hints at deference to a diocesan or relief through his rule. He lays all the responsibility on the elders. The Church at Philippi (i. 1) had its "bishops and deacons," and not a hint is given of the need of a diocesan. Titus was left in Crete to "ordain elders in every city." Not one word is said of any successor to him who would claim submission and manage affairs.

Having in view these facts, we can see how the providential forces at work in the Jewish Church prepared for the organizing of Christian congregations with governing bodies of elders. It is needless to hunt up parallels in civil life to explain the like arrangement in churches of Gentiles. The churches which God's blessing on Anglican missionaries' work in India secures, will take the form of the Anglican Church. The Presbyterian missionaries organize their native brethren on Presbyterian lines. The aggressive workers—missionaries—of the Apostolic Church were Jews, and they organized on Jewish lines. Nowhere do the apostles say: "Your elders were equal in rank, and managed your affairs,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but it shall not be so any more. You shall have successors to us, diocesan bishops who will be over you, and who will be above pastors, will consecrate successors in the episcopate, and ordain the lower orders of the clergy among you." We argue from the absence of any repeal of the law making children members of the Jewish Church that no repeal was contemplated. The silence of the founders of the churches as to prelatic successors to them we take as conclusive in like manner that no change was contemplated.

3. We hold that the New Testament treats the *presbuteroi* and *episcopoi* as two names for the same officers. Why argue this? Because it is common to say in defense of prelacy that the *episcopos came to mean* one superior to the elders, as one can see in the Fathers. We say this plea is worthless, hardly even deserves notice. "My Father is greater than I," came to mean at an early day, and in a most pronounced way, that Jesus was not in any sense the equal of the Father. The "power of the keys" came to mean papal supremacy. Do we therefore stand with Arius or submit to the popes? No. We aim at realizing the plan of the apostles and the ideal of the New Testament before decay and apostasy began. It is of importance, therefore, to show that in the New Testament the "elders" and the "bishops" were the same parties with the same powers. The friends who are interested in prelacy are the only parties who are interested in denying our position; so we shall be content to offer our readers the conclusions to which representative Greek scholars, with every inducement to think otherwise, have been brought. Alford, a dignitary of the Anglican Church, combines the views of De Wette and Meyer, and says: "The *presbuteroi* are in the New Testament identical with *episcopoi*" (see Acts, xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7; 1 Peter, v. 12). Then quoting in evidence of his position Theodoret on Phil. i. 1, he adds: "The title *episcopos* as applied to one person superior to the *presbuteros*, and answering to our 'bishop,' appears to have been unknown in apostolic times." The same author says on Acts, xx. 17: "The English version has hardly dealt fairly, in this case, with the sacred text in rendering *episcopous*, ver. 28, 'overseers,' whereas it ought there, as in all other places, to have been 'bishops,' that the fact of elders and bishops having been originally and apostolically synonymous might be apparent to the ordinary English reader, which now it is not." No. King James's translators (who put in Easter for Passover) did not wish to imperil

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their bishops, and hence the unauthorized postscript to the Epistle to Titus making him out "first bishop of Crete." Millions of good Anglicans have represented him to themselves in full canonical costume, mitre on his head and crosier in hand. Here, of course, as in other cases, the Revision sustains the Presbyterian view. It would be easy to add testimony of the same kind from Bishop Ellicott, Dean Stanley, not to speak of devout and sensible Anglican commentators like Thomas Scott.

That good men making these admissions yet accept prelacy on the ground of its development, of a process of evolution, of its early post-apostolic establishment is a matter for themselves. On their conscientiousness we make no reflection. We only allege that to us this line of argument seems to "give away" the Protestant cause; and as a concession it justifies Presbyterians in keeping their ground, consistently with their belief that the Scriptures are a perfect rule of faith and practice, and that the Church is to be organized on the lines the apostles lay down.

It may be mentioned as confirmatory of the views here given that Luke reports in the "Acts of the Apostles" the appointment of apostles and of deacons among Jewish believers, but says nothing of the eldership. Why? Because the eldership was the one permanent recognized office of the Jews, and without any need for appointment passed on into the Christian churches composed of Jews. But when Gentiles are organized into churches, as at Lystra, Iconium and Antioch (Acts, xiv. 23), he reports the "ordaining" ("appointing," in Revision) of elders in every church. So Titus has to set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint elders in every city of Crete (Tit. i. 5), these elders being of course identified in ver. 7 as "bishops" or overseers.

Now it may be objected that there is no popular right here, that Titus is spoken of as "appointing." Let this be illustrated. An agent of the Sunday-School Union goes through Dakota, organizes schools, getting teachers and pupils together, showing the need and place of a superintendent, etc., and leading the people to choose and call some one of their number thereto, he aiding with needed counsel. Would it be a historical error, or imply any disregard of the people's rights, if he said, "As instructed, I set in order the things that were wanting, and appointed officers in all the schools?" Surely not. Now the language of Acts, xiv. 23, runs in the Revision: "And when they had appointed for them elders

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in every church"—not one elder but several, in each church. But the Greek word for "appointed" bears out our analogy precisely. Dr. Lechler of Leipsic (in "Lange's Commentary") on Acts xi. 23, gives a long and clear statement of which this is the substance. "*Cheirotoneo*" (we put the Greek word in English letters) "signifies: *to raise the hands; to vote, elect by stretching out the hands.* The expression accordingly suggests the thought that the apostles may have appointed and superintended a congregational election. And this view is supported by the circumstances related in ch. vi. 2 ff., where the Twelve directed that the election of the Seven should be held." Paul and Barnabas, then, he argues, did not nominate suitable men solely on their own authority. They aided the congregations in the election. There is not a week in the year in which new Presbyterian churches are not supplied with officers in identically the same way. The people of the early churches are told of the need; their confidence in some of their own number is an essential to their filling the places; they agree on the selection of these officers, and the organization needed, where there were so many adversaries, is completed. The plan was simple, in the line of the ways of the people, and is a precedent for all time.

That later methods came in we can well understand, but we do not imitate them. A writer in "Appleton's Cyclopedia" on "Bishop," says: "At first the bishops were elected by the clergy and people of the diocese, but on account of the tumults inseparable from popular assemblies, various councils, from that of Laodicea in the fourth century to that of the Lateran in 1215, restrained and suppressed the electoral rights of the laity." Passing by the opening clause—the whole article is crude—would the "development," or "evolution," described here be a precedent for a Christian Church in the United States to-day? If not, why not? Poor human nature sometimes makes trouble in choosing ministers, trustees, even choirs, as it does, now and then, in political elections. Shall we get rid of all that by "suppressing all electoral rights of the laity?" This would be the logical following out of the principle that post-apostolic development is to be our rule.

We repeat, then, that the parity of the ministry, the existence of only elders and deacons, and the identity of the elder with the bishop—the distinctive features of Presbyterianism—are, as principles of organic life, illustrated and enjoined in the New Testament,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is our authority in this matter. "Priests" in the Anglican sense, as men who alone can, as separate from preaching deacons, administer sacraments and "absolution" are nowhere recognized in the New Testament. All believers are a "holy priesthood." The ministers of the gospel are not described as priests in Scripture, nor by us. We deem the word unscriptural and mischievous and representative of ideas unprotestant, and which is final, unscriptural. "Successors to the apostles," in any rational sense of that phrase, are nowhere to be found in the Scriptures. If they were to be, twelve would be, as with the Irvingites, the logical limit. Diocesan bishop are, whether for good or ill, post-apostolic. We aim at being apostolic.

If varied repetition of these things has made them clear, we may add that on the same general line the Presbyterian Church goes without fasts and festivals, saints' days, and rites which the Catechism, already quoted, makes out to be "lesser Sacramental Rites," as Confirmation and Absolution. Nor do we put "Holy Orders" and Matrimony in this relation. If we did we might as well take the seven sacraments of Rome. Nor do we call the communion-table an "altar," nor hold with this Catechism that in the Lord's supper first the bread and wine, afterward the body and blood of Christ, under the form of bread and wine, are offered to the First Person of the Godhead. We know that this view was "developed" in the progress of the ages, but we reject it as unscriptural. Forms of prayer Presbyterianism allows, but does not make them uniform and compulsory. These are specimens of details in which Presbyterianism follows its rule of deference to the New Testament on all that affects the Christian Church.

We now pass naturally to the third matter proposed to be touched, namely, some of the ways in which Presbyterianism is differentiated from other systems of Church organization. Except in the matter of names it is the same with the Reformed Church till lately known as "Dutch." The Congregational and Baptist brethren, as a whole, group together neighboring congregations, the pastors and some representatives of the people meeting as an "Association" for the recognizing of churches, settling of ministers, and the like, but they disclaim any more than advisory authority. Presbyterianism makes this executive, but gives the right of appeal, to any member, to the higher courts, much as the State gives to a citizen. This, however, is a matter of agreement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and arrangement, and the present writer has, again and again, been permitted to join in "Association" meetings that had all the merits of an orderly Presbytery, and he is bound to confess he has seen Presbyteries where some resolutions at least were treated as only "advisory," and not acted on even at that.

The English and Canadian Methodists, now having the laity represented in their courts, are so much on Presbyterian lines that in the Dominion a union of the organizations has been gravely proposed. We do not—the writer here speaks for himself—regard the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church as claiming succession to the apostles, the sole right to ordain, or other individual powers. They are rather like the synodical missionaries of the Presbyterian churches in the Western States, chosen by the church in its Presbyteries, set free to inspect, advise, arrange, find places for men, and men for places. That they are not an essential of that Methodism which God has so blessed, is shown by their being peculiar to the United States. Methodism in Great Britain is not "episcopal" and has no bishops. It may be said that Presbyterians differ in modes of administration. Granted; but the Anglican Church in the Old World and the Anglican in the United States have wider differences, springing out of their respective histories, than ordinary Presbyterian churches present, and there are no such divergencies of convction as we see represented in the Anglican "High Church," "Low Church," or Evangelical, and "Broad" Church parties. It is sometimes alleged that Presbyterianism does not hold the people. Well, look to England with royal and government patronage, endowments, universities, and all outward things in favor of the "Established Church," and a good half of the people have gone out of it. In Scotland, on the other hand, most of the landowners are of the Anglican Church and have often been extremely partisan, and yet about two hundred and fifty small Anglican congregations represent the numbers that have kept, or gone, out of the national Presbyterianism. There is, moreover, this suggestive distinction, that while bodies have gone out of the Scottish Church, it has been to find a purer Presbyterianism, while in England, Dissent has never tried to carry with it the distinctive features of "the Church." It seemed to say, "farthest from these is best."

If inquiry be made as to the Presbyterian way of combining churches in synods and assemblies, on a plan not recognized by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

multitudes with whom we are one in the substance of doctrine, we have only to say that as we read the New Testament we cannot but see that in Jerusalem, for example, with five thousand believers at a very early day, there must have been many congregations. Even differences of nationality and of language would contribute to this; but they are grouped together as the "Church at Jerusalem." And when error as to the continuance of Judaistic rites threatened the peace and purity of the Church, a conference, synod, or general assembly (we shall not quarrel over details of name), met as reported in Acts, xv., considered the matter, and came to a decision described in this fashion: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders with the whole Church to send," etc. The writing of the decision was on this wise: "The apostles and elders and brethren" (or in the Revision, "the apostles and the elder brethren") "send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." A deputation of brethren with their letter seems to have settled the matter, ended the strife and produced great joy. Not only so but (Acts, xvi. 4) as Paul and his associates "went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem," to the establishment in the faith of the churches and their daily increase (ver. 5). On this line we proceed, in all matters common to widely scattered congregations, in synods and assemblies. The idea of the unity of all the churches, rather than the independence of each of all the rest, seems to be assumed through the narrative. But we repeat that the points of divergence here are of comparatively little importance. A Presbyterian synod on a missionary day and a meeting of the A. M. B. C. for Foreign Missions have much in common.

The same general remark applies to our Baptist brethren. It has been the frequent joy of the present writer to partake of, even to administer, the communion in Baptist churches. A Presbyterian Church receives the certified member of any Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, or Congregational Church as a brother, demanding no further qualifying rite. So the ministers ordained in any of these bodies are received on equal terms. Re-ordination is not required. That interchange of pulpits with them is both common and delightful, does not need to be proved. There are divergences of view, but they are not held to be barriers to communion either in feeling or in working.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Catechism already referred to, the "Catholic Church is made to consist of the Roman, Greek and Anglican," *not* in communion with one another; and the great churches just named outside them are the "Protestant sects," called so, we are told, from a Latin word to *cut off*; "they have cut themselves off from the full fellowship of the Christian Church." Without discussing the meaning and origin of the Latin "secta," or the charity of this application of it, we only claim that Presbyterianism is more catholic, more scriptural, more self-consistent, than "Anglican, Greek or Roman," so widely separated from one another, and so pronounced in their censures upon one another, and that it is adapted by its organization to work easily and harmoniously with the great bodies of believers known as Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, and constituting no small portion of the great Church of Christ on the earth.

There are only two points to which, in conclusion, we devote a few sentences. Taking the argument of such a writer as Hatch, we see that the "evolution," until errors came in, and Church and state came into new relations, produced in the earlier stages practically Presbyterian congregations. "When," he says, p. 78, "the episcopal system had established itself, there was a bishop wherever in later times there would have been a parish church. From the small province of proconsular Asia, which was about the size of Lincolnshire, forty-two bishops were present at an early council: in the only half-converted province of North Africa 470 episcopal towns are known by name." This is a familiar truth to Presbyterians of the Old World, and hence they have no difficulty in accepting the statement that St. Patrick, when Ireland had but a small population, left it with 365 bishops. They were "bishops" of so many congregations; and if Rome and England had left the island to this organization and the connected doctrines, there would, probably, be less complication about the Irish problem today!

Our second point is that Presbyterianism is well adapted to work on a line parallel with that of civil institutions in the United States. The history of the Constitution readily explains this fact. Election of officers by the people—an element which the Anglican Church in England largely ignores, the accountability of officers to their peers, independence of the sections in their own matters, inter-dependence of the whole, with sessions, presbyteries, synods,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and assemblies or supreme courts, up to which appeals can be carried—in these things American citizens find a simplicity, a practical directness, and a recognition of individual rights with which their civil life—if they accept its responsibilities, must make them familiar. They find the Church's teachers are not "priests," but ministers chosen by themselves; they with the people, make a "holy priesthood;" all true churches and ministers are in succession to the apostles in holding their doctrines (the apostles, in the nature of things, could have no successors); nothing human—antiquity, tradition, "fathers," or councils—divides authority with the supreme word of God, enthroned in the Church as it is to be in the heart; and they find all ecclesiastical history warning against the beginnings of compromise and surrender, just as civil history shows how liberty is secured only by constant resistance to insidious interference with original and heaven-bestowed rights.

JOHN HALL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEFENSE OF CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA,

In 1862, 1863 and 1864.

II.

THE repulse of Admiral Dupont's iron-clad fleet before Charleston had not been looked upon as a thing possible by the North; and when the news of the Federal discomfiture reached that section, it engendered a heavy gloom of disappointment and discouragement—a feeling not unlike that which had prevailed there after the Confederate victory at Manassas, on July 21st, 1861. It was clear to me, however, that the enemy, whose land forces had not co-operated in this naval attack, would not rest upon his defeat, but would soon make another effort, with renewed vigor, and on a larger scale. Public opinion at the North would have given the Federal Administration no quiet had nothing further been attempted to retrieve what the New York Herald had already called "one of our most discouraging disasters," and another journal had denounced as "a shameful abandonment of the siege." I was therefore very much concerned when, scarcely a week afterward, the War Department compelled me to send back to North Carolina Cooke's and Clingman's commands, and, early in May, two other brigades, numbering 5,000 men, with two batteries of light artillery, to re-enforce General Joseph E. Johnston, at Jackson, Mississippi. The fact is, that on the 10th of May, Mr. Seddon, the Secretary of War, had even directed that still another force of 5,000 men should be withdrawn from my department to be sent to Vicksburg to the assistance of General Pemberton. But my protest against so exhaustive a drain upon my command was fortunately heeded, and I was allowed to retain the reduced force I then had under me, amounting on the 1st of June, for the whole State of North Carolina, to not more than 10,000 men. With these, it was evident, I could not protect each and every vulnerable point at the same time, and, henceforth, whenever the occasion arose, I had to withdraw troops from one quarter of the department to re-enforce another.

When, on the 12th of June, 1863, General Gillmore relieved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Hunter and assumed command of what was called "the Department of the South," the enemy already occupied "Folly Island, north of the Stono; Seabrook Island, on the north Edisto; St. Helena Island, Port Royal Island, Hilton Head Island, Tybee Islands, Fort Pulaski, Ossabaw Islands, Fort Clinch, and Amelia Island, and the City of St. Augustine."* The fact that a new commander, of high engineering repute, had been sent to supersede General Hunter, confirmed me in the opinion that we would not have to wait long before another and more serious attack was made. A further reason for such a belief was the presence at that time of six Federal regiments on Folly Island, under Brigadier-General Vogdes, an officer of merit, perfectly familiar with Charleston and the surrounding country, he having been stationed at Fort Moultrie before the war. I had notified the War Department to that effect by a telegram dated May the 10th. It read as follows:

"Enemy in force on Folly Island, actively erecting batteries yesterday."

Again on the 15th of June, speaking of the depletion of the forces under me, I drew the attention of the War Department to the danger of an attack by Morris Island, and even indicated the possible result of General Gillmore's operations. I said:

". . . The force in the department is already at the minimum necessary to hold the works around Charleston and Savannah, constantly menaced by the proximity of the enemy's iron-clads.

"The garrison of no work in the harbor can be withdrawn or diminished, as they are all necessary links in the chain of defenses. . . . It is not safe to have less than a regiment of infantry on Morris Island, which, if once carried by the enemy, would expose Fort Sumter to be taken in reverse and demolished."

I was making the greatest exertion to have finished an important battery which, by my orders, was in progress of construction near the south end of Morris Island. Want of adequate labor prevented its completion in time. Another paramount obstacle also thwarted me: no heavy guns could be procured for it.

On the 7th of July four monitors were seen off the Charleston bar. The fleet had not otherwise increased up to that day. During the night of the 8th the noise, apparently made by extensive chopping with axes, was distinctly heard from the extreme south-

* General Gillmore's book "Engineer and Artillery Preparation against Charleston," p. 18.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ern end of Morris Island. The sound reached us, but we were unable to distinguish what was really going on. The sand hills, so numerous on Little Folly Island, afforded much facility to the enemy for keeping us in the dark as to his ulterior designs, although nothing indicated any effort on his part at concealment. The following is an extract from my official report to the War Department upon this important event in the siege of Charleston:

"On the night of the 9th of July an immediate attack being anticipated, the whole infantry force on the island was kept under arms at the south end.

"At five o'clock on the morning of the 10th of July the enemy's attack commenced by a heavy fire on our position, from a great number of light guns apparently placed during the preceding forty-eight hours in the works lately thrown up on Little Folly Island. Three monitors about the same time crossed the bar, and brought their formidable armaments to bear on the left flank of our position, while several barges with howitzers in Light-house Inlet flanked our right.

"For two hours the enemy kept up the fire from these three different points, our batteries replying vigorously.

"The barges of the enemy, filled with troops, having been seen in Light-house Inlet in the direction of Black Island, and Oyster Point being the nearest and most accessible spot for debarkation from them, it was justly considered the one most necessary to protect, and therefore the infantry, consisting of the Twenty-first South Carolina Volunteers, about 350 effective men, were stationed by Colonel R. F. Graham, the immediate commander of the island, on the peninsula leading to that point.

"In this position the infantry were unavoidably exposed to the fire of the boat howitzers, but sheltered by the nature of the ground from that of the guns on Little Folly Island.

"About seven o'clock the enemy advanced on Oyster Point in a flotilla of boats containing between two and three thousand men, a considerable portion of whom endeavored to effect and hold a landing, in which they were opposed by the infantry until about eight o'clock, when another force of two or three regiments made good a landing in front of our batteries on the south end of Morris Island proper. These formed in line of battle on the beach, and advanced directly upon our works, throwing out on each flank numerous skirmishers, who very soon succeeded in flanking and taking the batteries in reverse. After an obstinate resistance our artillery had to abandon their pieces—three 8-inch navy shell guns, two 8-inch sea-coast howitzers, one rifled 24-pounder, one 30-pounder Parrott, one 12-pounder Whitworth, three 10-inch sea-coast mortars—eleven in all—and fall back.

"Two companies of the Seventh South Carolina Battalion, which arrived about this time, were ordered to the support of the batteries; but they could not make head against the overwhelming numbers of the enemy.

"This success of the enemy threatened to cut off our infantry engaged at Oyster Point from their line of retreat; and, consequently, about nine o'clock,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Colonel Graham gave the order to fall back to Battery Wagner, which was accomplished under a severe flanking fire from the monitors.

"The enemy thus gained possession of the South end of Morris Island, by rapidly throwing a large number of troops across the inlet, which it was impossible for the available infantry on the spot, about 400 effective men, to resist.

"It was not the erection of works on Little Folly Island that caused the abandonment of our position; it was clearly the want on our side of infantry support, and the enemy's superior weight and number of guns, and the heavy supporting brigade of infantry, that swept away our feeble, stinted means of resistance."

It is not true that this attack was a surprise. The commander of Morris Island and all the troops on it knew that the enemy was preparing to make one from Little Folly. I knew it as well, and the War Department was also aware of it; for I had kept the Secretary of War and General Cooper well advised of all the operations of the enemy in my command, and, especially, of his movements in that particular quarter. The real cause of the Federal success, on the 10th of July, was insufficiency of our infantry force on Morris Island; let alone the fact that I could not, for want of necessary labor, complete the battery already referred to, and which was of no service whatever to us on that occasion. The following table shows what force I could dispose of, at that time, in and around Charleston, that is to say, in all the First Military District of South Carolina. I had:

1.—On James Island—		
Infantry	1,184	
Heavy and light artillery	1,569	
Cavalry	153	
		2,906
2.—On Morris Island—		
Infantry	612	
Heavy and light artillery	289	
Cavalry	26	
		927
3.—On Sullivan's Island—		
Infantry	204	
Heavy and light artillery	726	
Cavalry	228	
		1,158
4.—In Charleston proper—		
Infantry	462	
Heavy and light artillery	235	
Cavalry	153	850
Total		5,841

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor should it be forgotten that the enemy, in order to divert our attention from the main object he had in view, was not only landing troops at the southern end of Morris Island, but was also seriously threatening James Island, and had made a strong demonstration against it by the Stono River. It is clear to me that, but for my determination not to weaken my force there for the support of Morris Island, this demonstration would have been converted into a real attack, the results of which might have been far more disastrous; for, as I have already stated, James Island was the avenue of approach I dreaded the most to see selected, and which on that account I feared the enemy would select. It was, in reality, the "entrance gate" to the avenue which would have almost assuredly led into the heart of Charleston. The enemy had preferred breaking in through the "window;" and I certainly had no cause to regret his having done so. That he was held in check there, and never got in, until we finally opened the "gate" ourselves, toward the end of the war, is not to be denied. On the evening of July 10th detachments from various Georgia regiments which I had called for, began to arrive. They were re-enforced by the Twenty-first South Carolina Volunteers, and Nelson's Battalion now garrisoned Battery Wagner. I also urgently pressed the War Department to order back Clingman's brigade to Charleston. Part of it came on the 12th. The day before, at early dawn, the enemy assaulted Battery Wagner, but was repulsed with great loss to him. Two Federal officers and some ninety-five men were killed within pistol range of our works. We captured six officers and about one hundred and thirteen men. Most of them were wounded. Three monitors and three wooden gun-boats assisted the Federal land forces on that occasion. Battery Wagner was again shelled on the 12th by part of the fleet, while the land forces were engaged in putting up works near the middle of Morris Island. They were very much disturbed by the accurate firing of Fort Sumter and of Battery Gregg.

On the arrival of the whole of Clingman's brigade and of other troops called from the Second and Third Military Districts of my Department, I was about to issue an order for an attempt in force to expel the enemy from Morris Island. But the configuration of that island, its proximity to the Federal monitors, and the fact, no less important, that fully four thousand men would have been required for that purpose, convinced me that no step of that kind

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could have then been successful. Our limited means of transportation was also a great drawback to us, and strongly militated against the adoption of any such offensive move on my part. Upon further reflection I came to the conclusion that we could do more toward checking the progress of the enemy by erecting new batteries on James Island and by strengthening others already in position there and elsewhere. I issued orders to that effect and they were vigorously carried out. Battery Simkins, in advance of Fort Johnson, on Shell Point, was one of these new batteries. It was armed with one 10-inch columbiad, one 6.40 Brooke, and three 10-inch mortars; and guns were taken from Sumter to increase the armament of Moultrie.

The damages in Battery Wagner were soon repaired, and the fire of the monitors and gun-boats regularly answered. Three guns, instead of two, were mounted at the Shell Point Battery; and I also caused gun-batteries of 10-inch columbiads to be substituted for the mortar-batteries at Fort Johnson. I ordered the forces on Morris Island to be reduced to a number strictly sufficient to hold our works there. And the enemy's pickets along the Stono having been increased at that time, I instructed General Hagood to advance at once on the position occupied by the Federals, and thus ascertain what was their real intent as to James Island. This was done with General Hagood's usual promptitude of action, and on the 16th the Federal forces were driven to the shelter of their gun-boats, our troops occupying the ground they had lost on that occasion. My order to Major Harris, Chief-Engineer, was, nevertheless, "to increase the batteries on James Island bearing on Morris Island by at least twenty guns on siege carriages, so as to envelop the enemy with a 'circle of fire' whenever he might gain possession of the north-east end of Morris Island; all works to be pushed on day and night." * On the 18th the Federal troops crowded the south end of Morris Island and took position behind their breastworks. It was clear that another attempt was about to be made against Wagner, and it was made with no less vigor than obstinacy. The "New Ironsides," five monitors, and a large wooden frigate joined in the bombardment. The firing of the enemy was more rapid on that occasion than it had ever been before. General Taliaferro, of Virginia, the gallant and efficient officer in command of Battery Wagner at the time,

* "Military Operations of General Beauregard," vol. ii., chap. xxxii., p. 117.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

estimated "that nine hundred shot and shell were thrown in and against the battery during the eleven hours that the bombardment lasted." Wagner answered but slowly to this terrible onslaught. Not so, however, with Sumter and Gregg, which fired with even more rapidity than the enemy, and, as ever, did splendid work. After dusk on the same evening the Federal fleet was seen to retire and the land forces advanced to attack Wagner. They displayed great determination. A portion of them succeeded in crossing the ditch and actually gained a foothold on the southern salient of the battery. General Hagood, with Colonel Harrison's Thirty-second Georgia, arrived opportunely at that hour, as per orders received from me, and was of great assistance in precipitating the flight of the enemy, though it had fairly begun before his arrival. In my report of this incident of the day is found the following language:

"The assault was terribly disastrous to the enemy. His loss in killed, wounded, and prisoners must have been three thousand, as eight hundred bodies were interred in front of Battery Wagner on the following morning. . . . Our own loss during the bombardment and assault was one hundred and seventy-four, killed and wounded."

From that time up to the evacution of Morris Island, the enemy scarcely allowed a day to pass without heavily firing upon our works—sometimes with his land forces alone, at other times with these and his fleet combined. He was also busily engaged on his batteries and trenches, while, on our side, we were straining every nerve to repair the damages done to our works and to strengthen the weakened walls of Sumter, whose disarmament was carefully carried on at night, in view of the disastrous effects of the enemy's heavy guns, from stationary batteries which would eventually render it untenable as an artillery post. That such a result was inevitable no one could possibly doubt, and that the whole of Morris Island would, sooner or later, fall into the hands of the enemy, was no less evident. But, so long as the batteries in process of construction on the main were unfinished, I had resolved to hold Wagner and Gregg to the last extremity. Every movement of the enemy was, in the mean time, watched with the utmost vigilance; while the accurate firing of Sumter, Gregg, and Wagner continued to seriously interfere with the working parties engaged on his lines of gradual approaches.

Among the most memorable incidents of this period of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siege was the seven days' bombardment of Fort Sumter, which commenced on the 17th of August and lasted up to the 23d. It appeared to be, on the part of the Federals, a desperate and final attempt to force the surrender of the fort, and thus effect the reduction of Morris Island, and even of the City of Charleston. This was evidenced by the peremptory demand which I received from General Gillmore on the 21st, for the "immediate evacuation of Morris Island and Fort Sumter," followed by the threat that, if within "four hours" after the delivery of his letter into the hands of the commander of Battery Wagner no reply was had, he would "open fire on the City of Charleston from batteries already established within easy range of the heart of the city." This communication reached me after the time specified, as must have been anticipated by General Gillmore; for it was evident that no message could go from Battery Wagner to Charleston and be answered within the limited space of "four hours."

I protested against the bombardment of a city filled with old men, women and children, before giving the customary notice of three or four days in which to allow them to escape from danger. From a work which was called "the Swamp Angel," because of the spot where it had been erected, the enemy, with an eight-inch Parrott rifle-gun, and before receiving my answer, did open fire upon "the heart" of the city. I have reason to believe, however, that the energy of my protest, which in due time reached the head-quarters of the Federal commander, forced him to somewhat recede from the position he had at first taken; for he ultimately ordered the firing upon the city to be suspended for the space of two days. When resumed it was not continued long; the "Swamp Angel" gun, after thirty-six rounds, very fortunately burst, and none other was mounted in that locality to take its place. The result of the seven days' bombardment of Sumter was to convert that historic fort into a confused mass of crumbling *débris*, but without altogether impairing its capacity of resistance. The greatest danger threatening the garrison just then, and one, no doubt, counted upon by the enemy, was the probability of the explosion, by shot and shell, of its powder magazine, which was, indeed, momentarily apprehended by the gallant men within the work.

G. T. BEAUREGARD.

(*To be Concluded.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT AND THE SENATE.

THE collision between the President and the Senate and the debate which it has caused are both interesting and important. They relate to the great central powers of the government. They foreshadow the issues of the next presidential election, as viewed by the leaders of the Senate. They have united the Democrats, for the first time during the session, in vigorous support of the President, enabling them to make an effective assault upon their opponents, who are not well united. They have called forth a significant condemnation of the secret and partisan methods of the Senate in dealing with appointments. They have rendered conspicuous its unwarranted claim of authority in connection with removals.

The debate has disclosed the precedents of official intercourse between the President and the Senate, but has not done justice to the rights of the former under the Constitution. It has hardly touched the conditions of good administration. With some exceptions, senators seem unconscious of the usurpations of the Senate, and of the absurdity of persisting in their own secret methods even at the moment when they are arraigning the President on the charge of concealment. In portraying the injustice of his alleged secrecy, senators seem unmindful that the people are making this answer: "You are describing your own secret doings. You have not the courage or consistency to let us know what you say and do, or to avow the principles or the interests by which you are guided. Open your own doors, and be *public* servants. You ask for papers, only to use them in secret sessions behind barred doors."

The result has been not only that the Senate has brought condemnation upon itself but that a distrust has been aroused which will not be allayed until the people are enabled to know what senators say, and how they vote concerning nominations.

It has been one of the curious facts of the debate, that senators have assumed an air of candor and disinterestedness, almost ludi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crous, when claiming themselves to be unbiased judges, and the Senate to be an impartial tribunal, for final judgment between itself and the Executive. Even democratic senators seem to forget that, by the common sense of civilized mankind, no one can be a fair judge in his own cause. The claims of the Senate, if allowed, would not only greatly increase the political prestige of each senator, but also, his patronage and his ability to re-elect himself. The liability to bias on the part of republican senators is far greater, for to allow their claim, would be to embarrass their opponents and to keep thousands of their own party in office.

Yet, not a lawyer in the Senate has appeared to be aware that we have a Judiciary—one of the three great departments of the government—which may properly have something to say before one of the other two departments can be allowed by an *ex parte* proceeding to adjudge the rights and jurisdiction of the third. I say *ex parte*, because the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate treated the President as an intermeddler, when, in a timely message, the President explained his motives and the facts of his action which the Senate had arraigned. Why has it not occurred to some member of the Senate, as it has to so many candid minds beyond it, that the true way to settle the question raised, is to bring it before the Supreme Court, where there would not be the bias of either partisan blindness, senatorial pride, or official patronage. Far from anything of this kind, the Senate, by a bare party majority, having decided for itself in its own case, in favor of its own usurpations and the patronage of its own members, has also adjudged, in like manner, a penalty to be enforced by itself, for questioning any part of its decree ; which penalty is, first, a refusal to discharge its own constitutional functions ; and, second, a resolution and a threat to obstruct the discharge of the function of the President, and the normal action of the government—an unprecedented and revolutionary policy which cannot be enforced, which now recoils upon its authors, and which tends to an issue between the House and the best sentiment of the country on one side, against the Senate on the other, in which the latter is certain to be defeated. In some particulars, democratic senators asserted the constitutional authority of the Executive with vigor. But they seemed blind to the usurpations of their own body, and unwilling to surrender the patronage which these usurpations have enabled its members to grasp. The larger and higher interests of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people and the true construction of the Constitution, irrespective of its effect upon the prestige and authority of the Senate, were lamentably subordinated to other topics. These short-comings, I assume, were not by reason of conscious indifference to the public interests, but are the natural results of the exaggerated views and theories as to the rights of the Senate now hereditary among its members. These views and theories, never adequately challenged anywhere—and generally treated as too sacred and hallowed to be questioned on the floor of the Senate—have hardened and ripened into a mysterious arrogance and a misleading, pernicious philosophy, never before presented in a manner so conspicuous and threatening as in this debate.

I do not forget the saying of Gouverneur Morris, that it is dangerous to be impartial in politics. All the more, therefore, I wish to state my high estimation of the functions of the Senate, and of the great part, as a whole, which it has acted. It has nobly preserved the freedom of debate. Its discussions have been more useful, and less tainted with personalities and demagogism, than those of the House. By reason of the longer terms and greater ability of its members, it has been by far the most useful body in legislation. Its vicious element, and its seduction from the path of moderation and justice, have been its share in the appointing power, which is utterly foreign to the functions of a legislative body.

Let us note the development of senatorial assumption, arrogance and usurpation which this element has caused. All legislative powers granted by the Constitution are vested in Congress, limited always by the veto power of the President. Among the enumerated powers of Congress, there is none which is executive in its nature; but the veto power, essentially legislative, is defined as a limitation on the legislative power of Congress. If the President vetoes a bill, it can become a law only by the vote of two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House. The Constitution, therefore, gives as much weight to the opinion of the President, even in matters of legislation, as it does to the opinions of one-third of the senators and one-third of the representatives combined. Hence, twenty-five senators and one hundred and eighteen members of the House are, at this moment, in their own sphere of legislation, less than a counterpoise to the President alone.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Constitution vests the executive power in the President. He is made commander-in-chief of the army and of the navy. He is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. He negotiates all treaties. He alone may fill all vacancies in offices when the Senate is not in session. He commissions all officers. He grants all reprieves and pardons. Contemplating that he will know, better than senators or representatives, not only the condition and needs of his great department, but of the whole country, the Constitution calls upon him "to give to Congress, from time to time, information of the state of the Union." It empowers him, at his discretion, to convene the Senate, to convene the House, or both of them, for business, and to adjourn them if they disagree as to an adjournment. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the treaties he has negotiated are made binding. By and with the same advice and consent, he appoints the ambassadors and all other officers whom he alone is authorized to nominate. Aside from giving this advice and consent, and the trying of impeachments, the Senate merely shares legislative authority equally with the House; but not always this even for the House has the sole power of originating revenue bills and of impeaching officers. A senator represents, in one-half part, a State. The President not only directly represents the whole body of the people, but he is to execute the policy they have approved in a national election, whatever party may control the Senate.

It thus appears that the President provided for by the Constitution, and the President recognized by the Senate, are, as we shall more clearly see, two very different officers. The participation by the Senate in the appointing power, known as the power of confirmation, is an exception from the grant of executive authority to the President, analogous to the exception of the veto power from the grant of legislative authority to Congress. Neither exception can be enlarged by inference, for each is equally repugnant to the general authority conferred. There is no more right on the part of the Senate to demand papers or explanations of the President relative to his exercise of the appointing power than on the part of the President to make the same demand concerning the exercise by Congress of legislative power. Equal liberty on the part of each is an essential condition of the constitutional independence and counterpoise of each, which are among the supreme ends of free government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The power of removal is nowhere expressly conferred by the Constitution. In its nature and the conditions of its exercise, it is wholly an executive power. How can members of Congress—who, in view of the Constitution, need to be informed by the President of even the general affairs of the country—know the internal needs of departments, the kind of service rendered by, or the character of particular officers serving under, the President? What could be more destructive of discipline and subordination, what more disastrously separate authority from responsibility, than to deny to the Executive the great power of removal and to concede it to one or two political bodies, which act by party majorities, and have neither the information nor the responsibility which are the essential guaranties for its salutary exercise?

When, in 1789, the question arose as to where the power of removal was vested, it was held, and has ever since by a vast preponderance of authority been held, to be an inherent executive power, distinct from the power of appointment, to be exercised by the President alone. For nearly three-fourths of a century this view was almost universally accepted. There was for many years little temptation on the part of senators to usurp it. In the whole period before Jackson's time, there were less than one hundred removals. The many he made stirred the ambition of senators. The Senate soon showed a disposition to encroach on the Executive, which that resolute President withstood in a way that furnishes an example for President Cleveland.

The creation of a four-year term in 1820 for collectors, district attorneys, and various other officers—a term before unknown, I believe, except in a single instance, among appointed officers—united with a rapid increase in the number of executive officials, greatly augmented the political importance of the power of appointment and removal, and made it very tempting to senatorial ambition. The demand for this term sprang from greed for patronage and a partisan spirit, nowhere more developed than in the Senate itself, or more pernicious than in the elections of its members. Jefferson declared, in 1820, in a letter to Madison, that this four-years' term "saps the salutary and constitutional functions of the President, and introduces a precedent of corruption which will soon leaven the whole mass of senators, and keep in constant excitement all the hungry cormorants for office, and render *them as well as those in place, sycophants to their senators.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These predictions were rapidly verified. Confirmations by the Senate began to be made not merely for partisan reasons, but so as to increase the patronage of senators and their power in their States. It was soon seen that each senator had but to concede to his fellows the same control over confirmations for their States which he naturally sought over those for his own State, to constitute him the dispenser-general of its patronage. The senators of each State divided their patronage to suit themselves, fulfilling the pledges of the last election and bribing voters for the next. Under the specious name of the "courtesy of the Senate," this vicious and demoralizing barter, division, and concession, screened by secret sessions, became the law and the scandal of confirmations. Under it the senators of each State became its partisan despots and feudal lords of office-getting. All the other senators were thereby bribed to neglect their duty of honest and fearless investigation in all cases outside their own State monopoly. This "courtesy"—this slavish law of silence and division—which has made many worthy senators blush for shame, which has put thousands of scoundrels into office, which has caused tens of thousands of worthy men to despair of office, which has demoralized parties and degraded the very name of politics—this star-chamber secret courtesy still lingers. It appears to have given one scoundrel and dunce a place even in the very hours during which its apologists have been arraigning the President for alleged concealment of his actions and motives.

Once able to control the selection of collectors and postmasters, senators found it easy to condition their confirmations upon the courtesy-monopoly senator having the selection of the clerks of the officers confirmed. The new collector at Baltimore seems to have declared that such was the fact in his own case last month. To give senators potential control of nominations, it was only necessary to use their political and legislative authority against President and heads of departments. That control had to some extent been secured by senators years before Senator Marcy proclaimed, in 1832, in a public session of the Senate, the senatorial doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils.

Senators found their increased patronage so enjoyable that, four years later—in 1836—a law was passed which, for the first time, created a four years' term for a class of postmasters—then about four hundred in number—and making them subject to confirma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion by the Senate. The desire for the patronage of confirmations seems to have been the motive for this new four-year term. There are now more than 2,200 postmasters subject to such confirmation. This requires 550 confirmations of postmasters every year, being at the rate of two every day the Senate is in session. Here is a constant stream of secret, vicious patronage. With such success in extending their patronage, what more natural than for senators to begin to inquire whether participation in appointments did not imply participation in removals? Might they not say they could not advise an appointment unless they thought the removal had been for a good senatorial cause? If the favorite of a senator was removed, or a friend of a political rival—or a member of the opposite party—was nominated, how could a senator approve? It was, therefore, good senatorial logic and morals, at least in the minds of some senators, to insist that the removal as well as the nomination, must be approved—even by the courtesy-monopolist senator! That most senators who have reached that conclusion were not conscious of other than patriotic motives I readily assume.

It was true that the giving of one power implied an intent to withhold the other, that the two are so absolutely distinct that an appointment must be complete before a removal can be proposed, and, also, that they are so unlike that a removal is the very reverse of an appointment, and may, perhaps, never be followed by an appointment.

No matter. Senatorial logic and metaphysics, backed by the great power of the Senate and the promptings of an insatiable ambition, may do much even against the President and the Constitution. There is even senatorial authority, however, for declaring that threatened refusals of confirmations and appropriations greatly desired by presidents and the heads of departments, have not unfrequently enabled the Senate to dictate removals as well as nominations. Only those utterly destitute of humor can keep sober faces when such precedents are now quoted to bolster more arrogant demands than the Senate ever made before.

Such an experience had well prepared the Senate for the bold avowal of its theories, of which the refusal of President Johnson, in 1867, to yield to its demands for patronage was the occasion. The tenure-of-office act of that year was the most audacious violation of the Constitution ever perpetrated. The Senate grasped a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

potential control of the power of appointment and removal, and became the dominating power in the government. Under that act even a suspension could not be made by the President except for "crime or misconduct," which he was required to report "to the Senate with the *evidence and reasons for his action.*" He was reduced to a mere executive agent bound to give, in each case of dealing with any one of his subordinates, humble and humiliating explanations at the bar of the Senate. The Senate was thus exalted to a power hardly less mighty than the senates of Rome and Venice. It had secured the gates of supremacy in the future.

The constitutional counterpoise had been destroyed. Good administration had been made impossible. Senators openly declared on the streets that "they had got the President in their power." They became autocrats in State politics. Their elections became more and more corrupt. Representatives were affronted by senatorial insolence. The law speedily became unendurable. In 1869 its most flagrant provisions were repealed, but others subversive of the essential rights of the Executive were retained. These provisions assumed that the power of suspending an officer, in its nature and effect a mere fragment of the power of removal, is vested in Congress, and was, through that act, conferred upon the President. Congress may unquestionably regulate, but so as not to substantially impair the power of removal, including that of suspension. But it has no such power to confer or to exercise, however much courage it may take to plainly declare the true construction on the floor of the Senate. There are not, I believe, five lawyers in the Senate who regard even the amended tenure-of-office act, upon the extreme verge of which the majority has stood in its collision with the President, as being constitutional. Every President and nearly every member of the Cabinet since its enactment has held it to be both unconstitutional and disastrously obstructive of good administration.

The retirement of President Johnson did not take away the ambition of the Senate, or the greed of senators for patronage. The everlasting truth in government that a power once usurped is never surrendered but to fear was to have a new illustration. It was in vain that President Grant in his first message recommended "the total repeal" of these acts, and declared them "inconsistent with a faithful and efficient administration of the government." With-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out answering the charge senators clung to their patronage and tormented the President about appointments. The House, in the same year, by an overwhelming vote, declared for the repeal of these laws. Senators, behind their barred doors, went on enforcing their courtesy, wrangling over places, and domineering in State politics. The House again declared for their repeal by a vote of more than six to one. Senators, in secret session, went on confirming their favorites and rejecting their enemies for reasons and by votes which not one of them dared make public and of which many of them were ashamed. The House, in 1872, for a third time, by a vote practically unanimous, declared for the repeal of these laws. The majority of senators, scorning the reiterated voice of the people's representatives, as they had the appeals of the President, persisted in their secret and demoralizing methods, which have been and now are the strength of the spoils system. They are as plainly repugnant to republican institutions as they are insulting to an enlightened citizenship. President Hayes called in vain for the repeal of these laws. For the cowardly silence with which they had met the language of President Grant, not a few senators substituted open defiance of his less powerful successor. As feudal lords of patronage, they were during his term the terror of the departments and the despots of State politics. Senators Conkling and Platt, because their supremacy was challenged by that executive agent called a President, resigned and went home to rally their clans in rebellion. He fell before that aroused public sentiment which finally made Grover Cleveland, then an unknown man, President—a sentiment, the strength and spirit of which some senators do not even yet seem to comprehend. President Garfield declared in the House that the tenure-of-office acts have caused "the usurpation by the Senate of a large share of the appointing power;" and in a magazine article that "the President can remove no officer without the consent of the Senate —*not often given*, unless the successor is *agreeable to the senator in the State where the appointee resides—a power most corrupting and dangerous.*"

Even such thorough believers in making the most of partisan opportunities as the late Senator Morton and Mr. Blaine have condemned these laws. Senator Hoar declared in this REVIEW, that, "in this way the Executive may be *subjected* to another branch of the government." Senator Pendleton declared that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

senators are thus "drawn into a neglect of the chief duties of legislation." In view of charges so grave, coming from such men, I am sure nothing I have said can be thought extreme. Compelled to admit that an appointment and a removal are two distinct and independent acts in the theory of the Constitution and the action of the President, senators have claimed them to be one thing, or rather the appointment to be both, on the side of the Senate, and for increasing its authority. This reasoning rests on the assumption that to determine whether John Jones is a fit person to be confirmed, senators need to decide whether Peter Simpson was suspended for good reasons. On this mere assumption, the entire argument for the Senate in the late debate is based. It affirms that the Constitution makes removals, not less than appointments, subject to the approval of the Senate. It repudiates the great decision of 1789 and all the precedents under it. It practically restores the repealed clauses of the act of 1867. It makes the secret committees of the Senate and a party majority of senators behind barred doors, deciding by secret party votes, not merely jurors on points involving their own patronage and the fate of great officers of their party, but also judges on appeal in every case, to decide whether there was good cause for removal, even where great questions of policy, determined by the people in the last election, are involved. The Senate and its committees as lords-paramount of patronage—thus interposed between the President and all his subordinates—are made supreme over conduct, discipline, character, efficiency, practical methods, and everything to which removals may properly relate; in short, everything which constitutes the greater parts of administrative functions. Such a change would revolutionize the government. The President would be made contemptible. The Senate would become intolerably arrogant and hopelessly corrupt, a patronage-mongering body, which would be sure to become odious to the people and unendurable by the House. Madison's prediction would be verified.

But let us not fear the Senate will ever get control of removals. The reaction against its attempts has begun. That reaction will repeal or greatly modify the tenure-of-office act. It will not stop until senators are forced to the duty of voting and speaking upon nominations under the public eye, or at least under rules requiring a prompt publication of their votes and speeches. The certain publicity thus secured, will leave small inducements for bad characters

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to gain nominations through lying recommendations, and poor chances for scoundrels being confirmed.*

Senators Platt and Logan comprehend this reaction. Their demands for open doors will gain as many votes for their party as the pyrotechnical, paleological, but not otherwise logical, spoils system advocacy of Senator Ingalls, will drive away from it in New York and Massachusetts, if not in Kansas. There was an early day, I believe, in Kansas, when all that was noblest in her citizenship was as little represented—and was as much ridiculed and maligned—in the Senate by the partisan leaders of political savagery and border-ruffianism, for rising above party proscription, and for asserting a manly independence, as the successors of that class of her people now are for acting in the spirit of their fathers. Self-interest and false theories distort the true proportions of things, and lead even great minds into strange inconsistencies. Here are some examples which would be simply laughable, if they had not led to obstructive measures in the Senate.

Standing by his seat in the Senate, from which, as we have seen, the President may dismiss him to his home, and to which seat he may call him back again, by directing an adjournment or calling a session of that body—seeing it plainly written in the Constitution, that the President commands the army and the navy, and that he alone can negotiate treaties governing our relations with all mankind—a senator, nevertheless, plumply tells us in this debate, that, "the President is an officer to execute the laws, *nothing else.*" Representing but in half part a State, in a body which has but two-thirds of one-half of the sum of the law-making authority, while the President, directly representing the whole people, has one-third of the law-making authority in each House of Congress, a senator, nevertheless, astounds us by asserting that the President, "is not one of the makers of laws!" A member of a body with no function whatever which the President does not

* This article was in the hands of the editor before the debate began on Senator Platt's resolution for considering nominations in open session. The debate has shown that the Senate is realizing the temper of the public condemnation of its secret methods—even more rapidly than I had anticipated. For moral courage, patriotic disinterestedness and comprehensive and forcible statement, no speech delivered in the Senate during the present decade equals that of Senator Platt's, on this resolution. It should be read by every thoughtful citizen. D. B. E.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

share, except that, rarely exercised, of trying impeachments, while the functions of the President, sweeping over the whole constitutional domain, save that of the judiciary, extend to every place on the globe where an American ship or an American citizen can be found, a senator, nevertheless, has the audacity to assert in this debate, that the jurisdiction of the Senate, "is INFINITELY BROADER than that of the President!" A senator, having first declared that the "state of the Union," refers to everything within it, and plainly hinted that the Senate is by far the greatest thing in it, next assures us that the clause of the Constitution which provides for the President's giving to Congress the information which the Constitution assumed it would lack, really means only this—that the President is a sort of Chief Executive Clerk, to gather and report facts and send up packs of papers as the Senate may be pleased to call for them; adding, admonishingly, that he would be guilty of an "impertinence," if he should speak, or give the people information about the Senate! Can arrogance go further than this?

Why, after such assumptions, be the least surprised, when the Senate haughtily "directs" papers to be sent to it which relate solely to the independent functions of this Chief Clerk—according to senatorial philosophy—sometimes called the President. What more natural than such strange language—to say no more—as this, in a single speech, concerning the President's message—a message which for candor, strength and sagacity is, to put it mildly again, in broad contrast to that speech: "—has interjected his supplementary report to the report of the minority;" "the argument of their fellow-coadjutor;" "I notice a very high official, in a supplementary report;" "his supplementary minority report." Is not the President, in fact, a mere chief clerk of the Senate? Indeed, cannot the clerk of the Senate perform the whole duties of the Executive and the trouble of having a President at all be saved? The public judgment upon these matters, I venture to think, varies widely from the views and theories of the Senate. It as strongly condemns the supercilious tone as it does the usurpations of that body. I think I but express an enlightened public opinion, worthy the serious attention of senators, when I declare there is great need that they should consider the Executive more in the spirit of the Constitution and less in the interest of their own prestige and patronage. If they do not voluntarily withdraw,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they must be compelled to retreat within their own constitutional sphere. The President is not a subordinate of the Senate.

The papers demanded by the Senate had no relevancy to any function of that body concerning the subject before it, except on its theory of sharing the power of removal; nor on that theory even, for the term of the officer suspended had expired by limitation before the Senate called for the papers. The President recognized the right of the Senate to have all the official papers on file in the public offices relating to its functions. He brought his claim for the independence of his office, not only within the constitutional limits, but within the limits approved by President Hayes and stated by Senator Sherman, when Secretary of the Treasury, in November, 1877, in answer to a similar demand made by Senator Conkling, speaking for the Senate.

Now, a few words concerning the debate as foreshadowing the strategy of the next presidential election. It can be shown, I think, that senators greatly overestimate the effectiveness of mere party discipline and partisan appeals, and greatly underestimate the political influence and the numbers which will stand resolutely for the reform policy of the President. The Republican party, in which the reform sentiment first became a political power, in great measure lost the strength it could give by refusing, in 1875, to support the reform policy of President Grant, and by too tardily passing the civil service act for retrieving that mistake, thereby making it possible for the Democrats to capture that power and elect President Cleveland by its aid; doubtless most of the Democrats believing they could force him to be unfaithful to that policy. They were mistaken. He has enforced the civil service act faithfully and with as much comprehensiveness as it was enforced by President Arthur. Within the civil service rules and examinations, the removals under President Cleveland have hardly exceeded those in the same period under each of the last three presidents. Looking beyond the examinations, we find that only 288 postmasters out of the 2,233 removable by the President have been displaced. I venture to assert that there are not five senators who believed he had the patriotism and moral courage to withstand the solicitation, the pressure and the threats, unparalleled in presidential experience, and in no small measure coming from senators themselves—required to keep removals within such limits; and to add that, while the partisan-bourbon leaders of the Democratic party sorely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deprecate the facts, there are fifty Democrats to-day friendly to a reform policy for every one who favored it a year ago. That policy has already become a political issue, threatening to divide the Democratic party into factions in at least one-third of the States, if it repudiates the policy of its President. The speeches of Senators Vance, Voorhees and Kenna show that they comprehend what I mean. To fight the President on a reform policy is to ruin the Democratic party. The Republican friends of reform, deprecating the sneers of their senators, and their injustice in allowing the President no credit for the great efforts he has made for it, regard him as being now its greatest champion. Regretting, as every friend of reform must, that more than 8,000 postmasters out of the more than 52,000 in all, have been displaced in a year, they do not forget that Republicans enforced a partisan test in their selection, and that the President has made a more heroic struggle than all his predecessors together ever made against the spoils system savagery, which has clamored for that universal proscription which every Republican leader predicted, and which many of them would welcome as insuring the return of their party to power in 1888. Several Republican Senators who have arraigned the President for allowing so many removals, hardly disguise their great regret that he has not made three times as many. They think such proscription would not only help their party to power, but that it would be a precedent, in that event, for another proscription which would give them unlimited patronage.

Of all the misrepresentations of the acts and motives of the President, none is greater than that which declares that every suspension carries with it an implied charge of corruption in office. He stated that he would regard the use of official authority and the neglect of public duty for partisan purposes as a cause for suspension; and, therefore, a suspension implies that indefensible kind of conduct, *but it implies nothing more.* Another misrepresentation hardly less gross, is that which declares that, by such removals, the President has violated the pledges on which he was elected. But the only authority referred to for the charge is a letter written a month after his election. No one can regret more than I do that the Democratic leaders are so greedy and short-sighted as not to leave the President at liberty to do better. His standard of duty is above that generally accepted by either party, and he deserves the vigorous support of the friends of reform in both parties.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Massachusetts and New York, the votes of which will be at least as decisive in the next election as in the last, the same reform methods sustained by President Cleveland have been enforced with the most salutary results during the past year. Governor Hill, of New York, who as clearly as any man comprehends the future of that State, has in his last message committed himself to their enforcement quite as emphatically as President Cleveland. The Democratic Mayors of Boston and New York City are vigorous supporters of that policy.

In such facts and considerations, senators and leaders of both parties may well see that a great political force is behind the President, that the decisive question will not be how zealous partisans will vote, but how that great and growing body of intelligent, thoughtful, conscientious men, little amenable to mere partisan discipline, will vote. No senator has spoken for them, but several have needlessly affronted them, in the late debate.

DORMAN B. EATON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GLADSTONE.

ONCE more Gladstone is to the fore. His return to power at the head of a coalition between the Irish party and the Liberals constitutes one of the most important political situations the British Empire has ever known. A Parliament composed, for the first time in history, of men elected by the people of every class, is to decide upon the claims of the Irish for distinct government and a separate Parliament—claims put forward by a party able to enforce them, or to throw either Whigs or Tories into opposition.

Gladstone, the friend of Ireland through many arduous struggles, the man who carried the disestablishment of the Irish Church, who re-made the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland—was opposed in the late elections to the attempted alliance of Parnell and Salisbury. He declared that the way to do justice to Ireland, and yet secure the integrity of the Empire, was to grant as a right, not concede under a threat, what Ireland demands. But the elections went against him, and he instantly rose to the situation. He pronounced it better for the Liberals to do what is right, even under defeat, even because they were compelled to, than to allow the same measure to be accomplished through the unnatural coalition of Tories and Irish patriots. He goes further, however, in yielding to the Irish than many of his own party, and must make a Titanic effort if he brings them up in sufficient numbers to his level. But he is used to contests and to victories; and this much is already certain: whatever the issue of a single battle, the result of the campaign will be the triumph of the principles for which he strives. If Gladstone should die to-morrow, his name would be forever associated with the emancipation of Ireland. He has made it sure.

The great antagonist of aristocracy in England began his career as a Tory and High Churchman. One of Macaulay's early essays was a Whig attack on a manifesto by a young man whom he styled "the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories." The book

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was Gladstone's defense of "The State in its Relations with the Church." To-day, the Tory has passed beyond the position even of the Whigs and left them far to the rear. In both Church and state they are the drag, and he is the leader—as the coach rolls rapidly down the hill of revolution—the Tories say.

His transition has been gradual. No statesman in history has grown more steadily or furnished a finer instance of evolution. For years he was simply the great financier of his party; he looked little to the revolutionary or progressive politics that were developing around him. But as the old leaders like Sir Robert Peel, Lord Palmerston, and the last Lord Derby, passed away, and Lord Russell became decrepit and finally senile—two younger men stepped into the arena, grander figures in English politics than any since the days of Pitt and Fox, and one at least destined to leave a deeper impress on the history of his country than even those giants of the Napoleonic day.

In 1869, when I first went to England, Disraeli and Gladstone were the acknowledged chiefs of the two great political camps. One had worked his way up by the adroitest use of all the arts of policy and personal address, by attacking his friends and deserting his chiefs at opportune crises, by truckling to the prejudices and trading on the fears of a powerful order; above all, by the aid of an intense selfishness that was able to perceive its ends from afar, and to subject principle and even passion to its purposes; the very Mephistopheles and Machiavelli of modern politics; mocking, insincere, indifferent, so far as others were concerned; persistent, devoted, all-grasping in his own designs; grand in his power to compel a race that he despised and an aristocracy that despised him, to do his bidding. The other was a religious zealot, an intense thinker, and yet a practical man, full of love for the Church, and saturated with scholarly veneration for the past, with all the inborn reverence of an Englishman for whatever is established, and the awe of a middle-class man for the aristocracy—yet impelled by the combined force of his own energies and ambitions, and the tremendous vigor of his ever-expanding intellectual convictions, as well as by the influence of the iconoclastic and reforming spirit of the time, that penetrated and finally permeated him, till he turned upon the institutions he had loved the best, and, like one inspired by the Fates, attacked and destroyed what he had been all his life upholding and defending.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was at the head of a brilliant band of ardent thinkers and earnest patriots, some of them, doubtless, crude or doctrinaire, impractical and over-zealous; others inclining to the extreme of caution, yet representing the element in English statesmanship which at that time had accomplished whatever had been achieved by or for the English people since the downfall of the Stuarts.

The first gage of battle was the Irish Church. Gladstone was made prime minister that he might overthrow that relic of the ancient alliance of Church and state which he had once written a book to defend. The religious enthusiast, the early apostle of Establishment, led the Whigs and the Radicals in their assault on the Church, while the political adventurer, the renegade from Liberalism, the foreigner in blood and belief, was the champion of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, of the aristocracy, and in reality of the court. Their rivalry lasted till the death of Beaconsfield. Only one of these men could be prime minister so long as both were living.

Gladstone's convictions, his enemies say, have always been easily changed when the motive was strong; and it must be admitted that his conversions have often been seasonable. Any one who had studied his career could easily have predicted his course in the Irish emergency. He was certain to yield when the Irish became irresistible, to lead those to victory whose victory he himself had opposed. Circumstances, however, make potent arguments. When the political necessity is pressing, the political vision becomes clearer; and emergency often compels to a course that if the emergency did not exist might be unadvisable. It should be remembered, too, that Gladstone's progress has always been in one direction. After he once set out toward Liberalism he has never been a backslider. When he could not proceed as far as he wished he has neither retreated nor recanted. Whatever the inducement, whether of hope or fear, he never returns to his idols.

He has been accused of a jesuitical tendency, of a disposition to find arguments in favor of acts after the acts have been performed, and it is certain that when good logic was not at his disposal he has sometimes resorted to sophistries unworthy of the preacher of purity and Christianity infused into politics. Two notable instances of this occurred while I was in England. One was generally known as the Ewelme scandal.

The living of Ewelme is in the gift of the prime minister, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a provision of law requires the incumbent to be a member of the University of Oxford. Mr. Gladstone had a favorite who was a Cambridge man, and so that this clergyman might receive the coveted preferment, he was first made a member of Oxford and then immediately promoted to the position reserved for Oxford men. The proceeding provoked much harsh criticism, and the Christian statesman certainly laid himself open to the charge of evading the law for personal purposes.

The other case affected the judiciary. Only judges who have sat in certain courts are eligible for appointment to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, a court of appeal of the highest dignity and consequence. Its members must be selected from the bench, so that their judicial experience may tell in their new position. But Mr. Gladstone appointed his attorney general, Sir Robert Collier, to a judgeship for two days, and then bestowed on him the preferment intended exclusively for judges. These acts speak for themselves. His enemies not unnaturally proclaimed that the man who talked so loudly of truth and purity had poisoned the fountains of both religion and justice, and carried his favoritism in spite of law into the Church and the courts.

These traits may not be omitted from the portrait, but it is pleasant to turn to other features of his character and other incidents of his career. The long list of his achievements in behalf of progress should not be forgotten in America. During his first two administrations Gladstone accomplished more than any other English statesman since Cromwell has even attempted in the way of overthrowing abuses and reforming institutions. He not only disestablished the Irish Church and renovated the system of Irish tenancy; he introduced the ballot into England, he abolished purchase in the army, he offered education to all, he brought about the recent extension of the franchise. He has opened the way for the admission of the poorest and humblest Englishman to the highest political rights, and made inevitable the modification and eventual abolition of the firmest-rooted wrongs and the unfairest privileges. Whenever equality, not only of position, but of opportunity, is established in England, Gladstone will be looked upon as the John the Baptist, the fore-runner of the Messiah.

In foreign matters he has championed the oppressed of many countries. More than a quarter of a century ago he directed attention to the atrocities of King Bomba of Naples, and assisted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in precipitating the downfall of that royal monster, and in this way pioneered the coming of the Kingdom of Italy. His eloquent utterances after the Bulgarian massacres, the tremendous invectives he poured on Turkish depravity, are not yet forgotten, and undoubtedly were the chief weapon that struck the cynical friend of the Turk, Lord Beaconsfield, from power.

For in foreign affairs Gladstone has never hesitated to manifest a spirit almost unexampled in the statesmen of any country or time. Hardly ever has republican or monarchist dared to set his country right when she was in the wrong, before the world; to confess for her the wrong, to withdraw her from a false position, to emulate the gospel spirit, and carry Christianity into politics on so grand a scale. The retrocession of the Ionian Islands, the similar policy in South Africa, the determination not to do evil in India that good might come, the refusal to resist the encroachments of Russia by perfidious or iniquitous means, or to support the Turk in evil practices because those practices might tend to the benefit of England—these are remarkable instances of what I mean. The submission to arbitration of the question whether England had done wrong in the Alabama matter—was a step of the same character; while the expression of regret for the injury inflicted was a humiliation that no statesman ever before in history put upon his country willingly. Some will call the act sublime, but there were many Englishmen who considered it pusillanimous. It was not pusillanimous, for it was not extorted by fear; and it tended to produce a cordial sentiment between the two countries that nothing else could have evoked.

Gladstone went through a storm of obloquy and condemnation on this account. I was in England and could watch his course. Public sentiment was so violent that at times the representatives of the United States felt its influence in their personal and social relations. And when the famous "Indirect Claims" were presented, the nations stood on the verge of war. Americans at home hardly appreciated the intensity of the British sentiment, but those of us in England, especially if we had access to official or important circles, knew the depth of the feeling. The press and Parliament were almost unanimous in their bitterness and their unfairness. But Mr. Gladstone never swerved from his intention or his effort to carry out what he had promised. His loyalty and the skillful diplomacy of Secretary Fish and General Schenck, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has never been recognized as it deserved, brought the two peoples through a crisis of no ordinary character.

The foreign policy of Mr. Gladstone has never met the general approbation of his countrymen: his genius does not shine in the sphere of diplomacy. Certainly the result in Egypt was not one to be proud of. The bombardment of Alexandria was a reproach to the English nation and an outrage on the civilization of the age—punished in the same region and the same decade by the disasters of the Soudan and the massacre of Gordon. In each of his earlier administrations Mr. Gladstone so mismanaged his foreign relations that they undoubtedly contributed in each instance to his downfall. He offended unnecessarily the spirit of the English nation, humiliated its pride, and seemed at least to ignore its interests.

And this cannot be attributed to his lieutenants. Though he had at the head of his foreign department a man utterly without force or originality, it was not Lord Granville's fault that the tangle was so bad. Gladstone is always master in his own cabinet. He controls and directs absolutely. His will is law. He dictates the general policy and decides every detail of importance, and his subordinates must yield or leave. His party too, has followed, as well as his cabinet. No man has more absolutely swayed the nation when he was at its head. It was he who determined on disestablishment in Ireland, and arbitration with the United States; on peace or war with Russia, and Africa, and Egypt, and America. It is he who made the coalition with Parnell; it is he who decided that Ireland must have a Parliament. Not Bismarck, not the first Napoleon, was more of an autocrat.

His ablest subalterns are proud to serve under him, though they scowl at any other chief. When, after the Liberal defeat in 1874, he retired for awhile from the leadership of the party—to a man they besought him to remain. And when upon his refusal, Lord Hartington was given the reins, Gladstone was still a disturbing element. Whenever for a night he appeared in Parliament, the nominal chief at once went into eclipse; and when at last his party returned to power, the country would hear of no one but him for prime minister. The Queen opposed him, but made herself and her weakness ridiculous by the opposition.

His personal popularity is prodigious, but like all great men he provokes the most violent animosities; not only among those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who know him individually, but in the country at large. He is hated by the mass of the aristocracy with a bitterness almost unexampled, but very natural, for with a true instinct they feel and know that he is their greatest foe. Whether he means or wishes it, or no, he hurts them more than any million of men beside. He once said of them: "The Lords are up in a balloon;" elevated above the ordinary world, but unable to observe or affect the course of affairs. Another time he declared that he should think once, he should think twice, he should think three times, before he would abolish the House of Lords; but if the third occasion passed, he did not say what his course would be. And these were the utterances of a man who had it in his power to fulfill his threats. More than once he has compelled the Lords to do his bidding by the menace of adding to their number or lessening their hereditary privileges. When they obstinately resisted the abolition of purchase in the army—although the measure had passed the House of Commons and was unmistakably approved by the nation—Gladstone revived a disused prerogative of the Crown, and forced the unwilling Queen to declare purchase abolished by royal warrant —a weapon that had not been resorted to for two hundred years. He strained the Constitution but he conquered the Lords. The last great difference between him and them was upon the extension of the franchise. In this instance the peers yielded in time; but had they held out, he would undoubtedly have shaken the very foundation of their position as legislators.

This single man, who threatens and assails one of the ancient orders of the state, who places himself in antagonism with an entire aristocracy, who forces a still powerful class to abandon its privileges and trample on its prejudices, is of course the object of their profoundest antipathy. But not only the aristocracy themselves; all the mass of their followers, all the prejudiced Tories of the middle and lower class, above all those of the press or the literary sort—detest the name of Gladstone. To compensate—about two-thirds of the English nation adore him. No one in England in my time could evoke the enthusiasm that followed him.

All this is the magic of genius as well as the might of will; it comes from the combination of intellect and character; the belief in his intention, the knowledge of his achievements, the sympathy with his efforts, the magnetism of his presence and personality, the authority of a born leader of men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of his natural gifts eloquence is the most easily recognized. His oratory is fiery and convincing by turns, but more often fascinating and persuading. His lucidity of speech, though he is neither terse nor often epigrammatic, is so wonderful that he is famous for the charm he flings about the most abstruse questions of finance. His long involved sentences never weary, are never obscure, and always lead up to some lofty sentiment that either excites the imagination or touches the heart.

Like most men of genius he exerts a personal fascination that is irresistible. His conversation is seductive in its interest. You cannot turn away from it. He holds you like the Ancient Mariner, till he "tells his tale." I was once asked to meet him at dinner, when there was no American minister in England. It was at the house of Lord Halifax, one of his colleagues in the cabinet, who had corresponded with me the winter before, while I had a room at the White House; and whose letters had been avowedly written for me to show to President Grant. At the date of the dinner the discussions of the Treaty of Washington were at their height, and there were grave doubts of the success of the negotiations. Lord Halifax asked me to meet Mr. Gladstone so that I might convey his opinions direct to the President. The prime minister talked half an hour with me alone on the subject of the treaty, and under these circumstances he naturally wished to impress me very fully with his ideas. I saw him therefore to unusual advantage, and was never more impressed with the power of a man to expound and illustrate and enforce his views by conversation. Afterward he continued the talk on other themes, and discussed the difference between the British and the American constitutions, the permanency of the systems and institutions of both countries; and was as brilliant and as fascinating as his reputation had led me to anticipate. I remember his saying that the American constitution was the most perfect ever written by man, which as a good Englishman he could admit, for the British pride themselves on the fact that their constitution is unwritten. He thought Americans had a great advantage in "elbow-room," as he called it; and that our institutions could not be said to have stood their severest test till the United States were as crowded as England is to-day.

On another occasion, some years later, he was good enough to ask me to breakfast. It was the morning of a day when there was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be a great debate, which he was to lead; the result might decide the fate of a momentous measure, and either retain him in power or overthrow him. He had at table a party of ten, only two of them ladies, and one of these his daughter. Among the other guests were a distinguished divine; an ecclesiastical architect or architectural ecclesiastic, I forget which; the liberal son of a duke, a member of the House of Commons, and so on. We sat at breakfast an hour and a half, but not a word was said about politics, not a reference was made to the debate in the evening. The principal subject discussed was the Revision of the New Testament which had just been given to the world. The prime minister was extremely interested in this theme. He is learned in his Greek, as every one knows, and quoted the original text freely. He was entirely opposed to the Revision, and offered to lay five pounds that it would never be authorized to be read in the churches. I was amused to hear him offer a wager and on such a theme, and said so to his daughter. She told me she had never known him make a bet but once before, and that was that Disraeli would be a peer before himself.

This versatility of attention displayed at such a moment was characteristic of his genius. His information is various and his learning catholic, as well as profound; his power to discuss the most different themes astounding. When he was for a while out of office and nominally in retirement, the activity of his mind was incessant. He wrote pamphlets on the Vatican decrees, published whole volumes on Homer and the Youth of the World (*Juventus Mundi*); and debated artistic, antiquarian, ecclesiastical, and purely literary subjects in half the periodicals in England. He was a lay reader at morning prayer in the parish church at Hawarden, and a hewer of wood in the park immediately afterward; and he answered himself every post-card that any one chose to send him. Finally, came his wonderful attack on the Tory foreign policy, which tumbled Lord Beaconsfield headlong from office and reputation, and indeed terminated his career.

Mr. Gladstone's position in regard to the American Rebellion was one of the mistakes of his life. He has had the courage to admit the mistake, and the magnanimity to seek to atone for it. He thought that the right of secession was implied, if not admitted, in the American Constitution, and like most Englishmen he failed to see the reasons that would have made the admission of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that right practically impossible even if it had been logically tenable. Even after his famous apology to the American people—"Kin beyond Sea"—I heard him declare that he still could not see that Jefferson Davis was wrong. This is what I should call the doctrinaire side of his mind, which disappears or is hidden completely in his practical contests in English politics. No man can put abstract notions more entirely aside than he, or so envelop them in a cloud of explanatory comment as to make them invisible or innocuous whenever it is desirable for his purposes.

He is, indeed, a curious development of the English type; a strange outgrowth from the Anglo-Saxon root. With his ardent religious faith, apparently never disturbed in this age of scientific and intelligent unbelief, with his lofty Christian sentiment, carried, however, more often into foreign than domestic politics; with the extraordinary indirectness of his mind in some of its workings, as manifested in the Ewelme and Collier affairs—he is in many ways as un-English a representative as it is possible to imagine. Intellectually, I have sometimes thought him more like an American or a Frenchman. His keen penetration, his logical acuteness, his abstract philosophy remind one almost of Emerson at times, while in profundity and power of generalization, he is not unlike Montesquieu. From one point of view the most transcendental and unpractical of statesmen, yet when he descends from the lofty heights where he evolves his theories of arbitration and religion, and doing good to one's enemies—to the arena of actual, daily politics, no one is shrewder, more politic, more adroit; no one sees the situation more clearly, and—far more important and rarer quality—no one is readier to adapt himself to the situation that he perceives; no one knows how to hit harder or parry better, or understands more exactly the strategy of important situations and the tactics of significant details. No one has carried great measures through greater difficulties; against the opposition not only of avowed enemies, but of loyal friends; against the influence of the Queen, the dislike of high society, the rooted prejudices often of the English people, the disapproval occasionally of the best and soberest minds. Yet he marches on in a career of successive triumphs. He defeats the heir to one of the oldest dukedoms, in his family borough; he forces his colleagues to the support of measures they detest, he compels the acquiescence of the court, he arouses and sometimes justifies the wildest appre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hensions of his enemies. He is, at the close of his career, the most important and imposing figure in English politics; the leader in the army of progress before the world; the champion of the people in a land where they still need one; the ally of a down-trodden sister country to whom he holds out a hand to assist her to rise. High-minded and high-purposed; with his faults, like all that are human, but battling always against wrong or in favor of the weak, he is indeed the model knight-errant, with even a Quixotic dash of romance in his temperament; but able to support as well as to attack, to defend as well as to destroy. This veteran of nearly seventy-seven, dashing against his enemies with the vigor of youth, leading the common people of England whom he has raised to a position and power they have never known till now; urging them to make the first use of that power to undo the wrongs of centuries in Ireland, offering to the men who had just dealt him the severest blow, the justice that they claim,—this man may not extort from the aristocrats of Europe the approbation he deserves, but Americans and democrats, believers in the people and friends of the people everywhere, cannot but wish him well in his last encounter with vested wrong.

ADAM BADEAU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOR CRISIS.

I.

THE Knights of Labor have undertaken to test, upon a large scale, the application of compulsion as a means of enforcing their demands. The point to be determined is whether capital or labor shall, in future, determine the terms upon which the invested resources of the nation are to be employed.

To the employer, it is a question whether his individual rights as to the control of his property shall be so far overborne as to not only deprive him of his freedom, but also expose him to interferences seriously impairing the value of his capital. To the employees, it is a question whether, by the force of coercion, they can wrest, to their own profit, powers and control which, in every civilized community, are secured as the most sacred and inalienable rights of the employer.

This issue is so absolutely revolutionary of the normal relations between labor and capital, that it has naturally produced a partial paralysis of business, especially among industries whose operations involve contracts extending into the future. There has been at no time any serious apprehensions that such an utterly anarchical movement could succeed, so long as American citizens have a clear perception of their rights and their true interests; but it has been distinctly perceived that this war could not fail to create a divided if not hostile feeling between the two great classes of society; that it must hold in check not only a large extent of ordinary business operations, but also the undertaking of those new enterprises which contribute to our national progress, and that the commercial markets must be subjected to serious embarrassments.

From the nature of the case, however, this labor disease must soon end one way or another; and there is not much difficulty in foreseeing what its termination will be. The demands of the Knights and their sympathizers, whether openly expressed or tem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porarily concealed, are so utterly revolutionary of the inalienable rights of the citizen and so completely subversive of social order, that the whole community has come to a firm conclusion that these pretensions must be resisted to the last extremity of endurance and authority; and that the present is the best opportunity for meeting the issue firmly and upon its merits. The organizations have sacrificed the sympathy which lately was entertained for them on account of inequities existing in certain employments; they stand discredited and distrusted before the community at large as impracticable, unjust and reckless; and, occupying this attitude before the public, their cause is gone and their organization doomed to failure. They have opened the flood-gates to the immigration of foreign labor, which is already pouring in by the thousands; and they have set a premium on non-union labor, which will be more sought for than ever, and will not be slow to secure superior earnings by making arrangements with employers upon such terms and for such hours as may best suit their interests. Thus, one great advantage will incidentally come out of this crisis beneficial to the workingman, who, by standing aloof from the dead-level system of the unions, will be enabled to earn according to his capacity and thereby maintain his chances for rising from the rank of the employee to that of the employer. This result cannot be long delayed; because not only is loss and suffering following close upon the heels of the strikers, but the imprudences of their leaders are breeding dissatisfaction among the rank and file of the organizations, which, if much further protracted, will gravely threaten their cohesion. It is by no means certain that we may not see a yet further spread of strikes, and possibly with even worse forms of violence than we have yet witnessed; but, so long as a way to the end is seen, with a chance of that end demonstrating to the organizations that their aspirations to control capital are impossible dreams, the temporary evils will be borne with equanimity. The coolness with which the past phases of the strikes have been endured, shows that the steady judgment of our people may be trusted to keep them calm under any further disturbance that may arise.

It is quite evident that the back-bone of the strike is broken and that the worst is past, and that a general recovery of trade will assert itself, more or less, in spite of whatever obstacles may be raised by the labor organizations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The labor movement inaugurated as a stupendous undertaking and announced to come off on the first of May, now past, has been a signal failure. The cause of justice and peace has achieved for itself new prestige sufficient to give it longevity, for the reason that the strike movement has been deprived of justification and right of existence.

Before the strike at the Missouri Pacific, Jay Gould was one of the most hated men in the country. He was anxious to have public respect and sympathy. He had made all the money he wanted, and was willing to spend part of it in gaining the respect and honor of the country. What his money could not do for him this strike on the Missouri Pacific has done. The sympathy and good-will which previously was with the strikers has been shifted from them to him. There is no doubt that the strikers selected the Missouri Pacific because it was a property with which Gould was known to be most largely identified, and because they thought that general execration would be poured out on him in any event. But instead of injuring Mr. Gould they have done him an inestimable service.

The timely and forcible action of Mayor Harrison, of Chicago, will put dynamiters and rioters where they belong, and thus divide the sheep from the goats in a very short time. If officials would sink political bias, the country would soon be rid of law-breakers and disturbers of the peace. As this plan has now been adopted, it will be far reaching in its effect, and stop mob gatherings, riotous speech-making and other such bad incentives, which recently have been so conspicuous in Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and elsewhere. The laboring classes, who are parties to the strike, will now have an opportunity to retire to their homes, where there will be more safety than in the streets—which will bring to them reflection; they will then soon become satisfied that they are the aggrieved parties; and the not unlikely result will be their turning upon the leaders who have deceived them.

There have been numerous vacancies created by the strikers voluntarily resigning. There has been no difficulty in filling these vacancies by those that are equally capable, if not more so, from other countries flocking to our shores. The steam ferry which connects this country and Europe has demonstrated this by the steamer that arrived in six days and ten hours' time from European shores to our own. As the interval between the down-trodden and oppressed operatives of the Old World and America is thus reduced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to hours Europe will quickly send to us all the labor we need to meet the emergency. Mrs. Gray, the Third Avenue Railroad Company and the Missouri Pacific, are the Generals that have won the victory. Strikes may have been justifiable in other nations but they are not justifiable in our country, and there is where the mistake was in organizing such a movement. The Almighty has made this country for the oppressed of other nations, and therefore this is the land of refuge for the oppressed, and the hand of the laboring man should not be raised against it.

The laboring man in this bounteous and hospitable country has no ground for complaint. His vote is potential and he is elevated thereby to the position of man. Elsewhere he is a creature of circumstance, which is that of abject depression. Under the government of this nation the effort is to elevate the standard of the human race and not to degrade it. In all other nations it is the reverse. What, therefore, has the laborer to complain of in America? By inciting strikes and encouraging discontent he stands in the way of the elevation of his race and of mankind.

The tide of emigration to this country, now so large, makes peaceful strikes perfectly harmless in themselves, because the places of those who vacate good situations are easily filled by the new-comers. When disturbances occur under the cloak of strikes it is a different matter, as law and order are then set at defiance. The recent disturbances in Chicago, which resulted in the assassination of a number of valiant policemen through some cowardly Polish nihilist firing a bomb of dynamite in their midst, was the worst thing that could have been done for the cause of the present labor agitation, as it alienates all sympathy from them. It is much to the credit, however, of Americans and Irishmen that, during the recent uprising of the labor classes, none of them have taken part in any violent measures whatsoever, nor have they shown any sympathy with such a policy.

If the labor troubles are to be regarded as only a transient interruption of the course of events, it is next to be asked—What may be anticipated when those obstructions disappear? We have still our magnificent country, with all the resources that have made it so prosperous and so progressive beyond the record of all nations. There is no abatement of our past ratio of increase of population; no limitation of the new sources of wealth awaiting development; no diminution of the means necessary to the utilization of the un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bounded riches of the soil, the mine and the forest. Our inventive genius has suffered no eclipse. In the practical application of what may be called the commercial sciences, we retain our lead of the world. As pioneers of new sources of wealth, we are producing greater results than all the combined new colonizing efforts which have recently excited the ambitions of European governments. To the over-crowded populations of the Old World, the United States still presents attractions superior to those of any other country; as is evidenced by the recent sudden revival of emigration from Great Britain and the Continent to our shores.

HENRY CLEWS.

II.

The method employed by the "Strikers" in this country, during the past ten years, and more especially in their recent strikes, is most unreasonable, violent, as well as disastrous, in its results.

The organization of labor was originally started to benefit the workingman by securing more pay for the same amount of work. All went well until designing men became the leaders. Some of the associations still retain the respect and support of the community at large: for instance, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, which is not only a benefit to every member, but is a benefit to the public at large as well.

There are traceable causes for the present state of affairs. Men read, or are read to; their minds are influenced, pro and con, by what they thus learn. The press of a community molds the opinions of those of its readers who rely upon it as their only source of information, and who accept its utterances as truth. A paper of 100,000 circulation has, perhaps, an average of three readers to each copy, and can, therefore, by misrepresentations, mislead three hundred thousand people each day. It can pander to man's very worst instincts and passions; or, on the other hand, it can bring men to a proper appreciation of their duty to each other and to what is equitable. Its influence for good or evil is incalculable upon those who depend upon it for their knowledge and guidance. The newspapers have had much to do with inciting dissatisfaction in the laboring classes.

The sudden accession of wealth by the few is another great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause of dissatisfaction to the many. How, in two generations, a fortune of three hundred millions can be accumulated by one family, in legitimate business enterprises, is something the ordinary mind cannot comprehend, and the more the bread-winner ponders over it the more dissatisfied he becomes.

Corruption in high places is still another cause of public discontent. The decisions of judges, in cases involving millions, have in more than one instance been so manifestly unjust as to create a suspicion of bribery. Yet impeachment and removal, for such offenses, are rare.

Impurity in city, state and national governments is another cause of irritation among the laboring classes.

The questionable methods of amassing large fortunes, attributed by the press and public to certain prominent capitalists and financiers, must also be added to the list.

The laboring man has read about, and thought over, all these things. The newspaper has told him of the "pooling" of railroad earnings; of combinations in coal companies to advance the price of that commodity; of the consolidations of both corporate and private capital. As a natural consequence, he asks himself, "Why should not labor also organize?"

These Knights of Labor associations were unquestionably formed, at first, upon a proper basis, and tended to improve the condition of the laboring man. For a while, they accomplished this purpose; but, gradually, designing men, politicians, and educated tramps, came to the front. The so-called laborers, who never did and never intended doing an honest day's work in all their lives, succeeded in being made officers; lodges were multiplied until the membership numbered thousands and hundreds of thousands, until, now, they assume to control the price and the hours of all labor, both of corporations and individuals, and to dictate how the whole business of the country shall be run.

The strike of the car-drivers in New York city to reduce the hours of labor from sixteen and fourteen to twelve, was a righteous one, and met with the sympathy and support of all fair-minded men. On the other hand, the strike ordered by Mr. Irons, on the South-western railroads, because of the dismissal of one man, was ill-advised and most unreasonable. It threw 14,000 men (only 3700 of whom belonged to the Knights of Labor), out of employment, directly and indirectly, simply because the managers of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of these roads, for what they deemed good and sufficient reasons, discharged this man. By this strike, a whole system of railroads, amounting to thousands of miles, was blockaded, and the entire business of a very large section of the country was brought to a stand-still. Many of the men who were then ordered out, are still idle, and the majority of them likely to remain so, as their places have been filled. The recent strike of the employees of the Third Avenue Street Car Company, of New York city, is another instance of a similar character. It is stated that, because there were eight men employed on the road who did not belong to the Knights of Labor, the strike was ordered. Nine hundred men gave up their means of subsistence because eight independent fellow-workers did not wish to join their order. They might as well try to compel all Freemasons to join the Odd Fellows. Since the riot, and the murdering of policemen and innocent people by dynamite bombs in Chicago, Grand Master Powderly and his lieutenants are anxious to pose before the public as law-abiding citizens, deprecating all violence.

But what roused the anarchists to action ?

A few more such strikes as those mentioned, and one-half the Knights of Labor in the country will be out of employment, to be supported by the other half. How long such a state of affairs can last, is a question which answers itself.

Some twenty years ago, when the Chinese Minister and his suite first visited England, they were found to be highly-educated, polished gentlemen. All England turned out to entertain them. The Queen bade them welcome, and her prominent noblemen did the honors, each in his own portion of the kingdom. The Minister was shown the beauties and wonders of London, taken to the ship-yards of the Clyde, and through the woolen mills of Manchester, where the finest machinery in the world is to be seen. Throughout their entire visit the Chinamen remained silent, merely observing, without commenting upon the machines that were shown them. Finally, a blunt old nobleman, who had become somewhat nettled by their silence and apparent indifference, determined to force some sort of expression from them. He asked what they thought of all this vast and complicated machinery and the results produced by it ? The Minister replied : " In my country we try to find work for two idle hands to do."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps Grand Master Powderly and his large army of sub-masters, instead of ordering strikes or allowing them to exist, had better take this lesson to heart and find work for "two idle hands."

Another story which fits the situation is one told of a certain General Wind who was neither a doer nor a lover of work—a sort of corner-grocery politician. He came puffing along Montgomery Street, San Francisco, one warm evening, with his arms full of sky-rockets. "Got our bill passed," he said, almost out of breath, to the ex-Collector of the Port, who approached him in surprise at his unusual effort. "Got your bill passed? What bill?" "Why our eight-hour bill—eight hours now constitute a day's work; the governor is going to sign it." "Well," the ex-collector replied, "that will take two hard hours' work off each day's labor that you and I perform." The general hesitated for a moment, and then dropped his arsenal on the sidewalk; for the first time in his life, he "saw himself as others saw him."

That is about the way some of the leaders of the Knights of Labor appear. So long as they can assess their brother workmen they will keep up the present labor agitations, or, at least, they will try to do so. The result must inevitably be a breaking up and falling to pieces of these organizations; for, as now managed, they are antagonistic to the constitution of the United States, and destroy the first principles of free government by restraining freedom of thought and action—reducing each man to a mere tool or machine in the hands of designing leaders.

Out of this break-up will come a laboring-man's organization founded upon the relation that should exist between the employer and the employed, and which will not only elevate and benefit the laboring man, but be approved of and supported by all classes of the community.

If Grand Master Powderly and the honest men he has associated with him in the management of the labor question, wish to benefit their fellow-workmen, they should listen to the advice of such good friends as desire to see them succeed in all just and reasonable demands; they should disband the present order, and start anew with an organization to be known as the Knights of Labor of the United States of America—admitting none to membership who are *not American citizens, and ready to uphold to the uttermost the* principles of freedom upon which our government is founded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They should make the order and its members amenable to the laws as they exist, and, as General Grant said, "if there are bad laws, enforce them and have them repealed."

Under such an organization, "boycotting" would have no place. It has always been maintained that "boycotting" was a foreign method and did not belong to the United States. Yet it has been practiced in our midst for years. Not until within a few weeks—since the Chicago riots—have the newspapers come out boldly and denounced it as a crime, fearing, perhaps, lest their own papers should be subjected to a boycott.

No matter how mildly practiced, boycotting is a crime, a conspiracy, that should be punished without fear or favor. The laws in the different States are not stringent enough to meet this particular offense, and a general law should be enacted without delay, which should place those engaged in boycotting behind prison bars. This would speedily end the infamous practice. Let the remedy be universal and sweeping—the punishment the same in all States and Territories, and its application instantaneous.

The President of the United States should rise above the level of the politician and for once act as a statesman, and should request Congress to frame and pass a law to meet this particular form of crime, and one that would nip it in its bud; instead of sending roving commissions to "investigate" and to use their time in making political capital for themselves and local politicians.

The Anarchists, Nihilists, Socialists, and Communists must be disposed of by the police and the criminal courts, and these outlaws be made to realize that, while this country has many broad acres and square miles of unoccupied land, it has no room for the criminal classes of Europe, and will not tolerate them.

But a large portion of the Knights of Labor are hard-working, self-respecting men, who have no sympathy with law-breakers or boycotters; and these men, these skilled laborers, should have a proper recognition in all large corporations. There should be three classes of employees, divided according to length of service, general ability, etc.—say, apprentices, journeymen and master workmen. Those who have been faithful in the discharge of their duties for, say, fifteen years, should be paid higher wages than those who have been but ten years with the company, and the ten year men more than the five, and so on, down to the new employees.

When times are good, the country prosperous, and the companies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earning and paying dividends, the workmen should share in the good fortune, and when depression comes and the companies are losing money, these same men should consent to a reasonable reduction in their pay. In other words, the wages of the employees should bear their proper relation to the profits of the business. Men should not be discharged without cause. This and all other matters of dispute should be settled by arbitration committees, in which both employer and employed should be fairly represented. A temporary increase in the help employed might be necessary occasionally, but that might be a shifting class of workers who should be taken on and cut off as required.

To sum up the whole question, there must be a full and fair recognition of the rights of each, by both employer and employed; and the latter should be as much interested in, and as much a part of the corporation or company he works for, as its road-bed, rolling stock, mill or machinery.

Another suggestion: If one-half the money, now spent in carrying on strikes, were used for buying land for idle men to cultivate, and a bureau established for inducing the unemployed to go west and till mother earth—which, after all, is the real source of wealth, and the only dividend payer—this war between capital and labor would be materially reduced.

And Mr. Powderly with his followers, should protect the "little red school-house on the hill"—the cradle and nursery of our future citizens, keeping it free from religious and political influences. They have the same interest in promoting the education of the coming generation as the rich have, and must see to it that the representatives of the working classes do nothing intolerant, or calculated to shake the faith of the young in free thought, free speech and the right to live and let live which our Constitution gives to all.

RUFUS HATCH.

III.

RECENT events have brought the old problem of capital and labor from the sphere of speculative opinion within the range of practical discussion. What I have to say on the question, however, at the request of the editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, must be more or less—and rather more than less—a new presentation of views that I have often hitherto expressed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The nineteenth century will be set down in the world's history as the century of material progress, and in its great advance the United States takes the lead. In this rich world this nation stands the richest. The valuation of property in 1884 was 51,670 millions in round numbers; that of Great Britain, mother and rival, being more than six thousand millions less.

In the United States wealth has increased from 1850 to 1884 forty-three thousand two hundred and forty millions of dollars. According to Mulhall, since 1830 Great Britain has almost trebled her wealth; France has quadrupled hers; the United States has multiplied in wealth six fold, and at present we are growing nearly four millions richer at sunset than sunrise each day. The accumulations of Europe and the United States make up daily $11,000,000, and the increase in population is 11,000 daily.

The great increase in population, large immigration from Europe, amounting in four years to over twenty-four hundred thousand people, overcrowding of cities, increase in manufacturing establishments, rapid absorption of public lands, consolidation of wealth, importation of contract labor, and other causes, are reproducing in nearly all the States many of the economic and social conditions of Europe. In the midst of great wealth, with powers of production unsurpassed, with material success unparalleled, there is, nevertheless, a social and industrial revolution.

I am, with others, to some extent an employer of labor. I take a deep interest in the labor question. To my mind it rises in importance above all others.

In Europe the discontent is due to two causes. One, the unfinished struggle on the part of the people for political freedom, which has been active since the eighteenth century; the protest against privileged classes, monarchy and imperialism. Learning that they are the source of all political power, the people want their will registered as the law that alone should govern them. This discontent has taken the form of nihilism in Russia; socialism in Germany; communism in France; radicalism in England; and mano negraism in Spain. These nations have also to deal with another cause—the industrial question, involving the relations between employer and employed, the rate of wages and the proper distribution of wealth, which is the recurring question of all civilization, the problem of all the ages.

The nations of Europe are obliged to meet both problems at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same time. This not only gives rulers great concern, but taxes to the utmost the ability and ingenuity of the wisest statesman. Some governments are making concessions to the people. In England classes are coming to an end, and henceforth the people will rule. The right of franchise has recently been conferred on two millions of English subjects. In other countries relief is sought through colonial expansion and immigration, and in Russia war is still invoked to subdue discontent and give imperialism repose for a season.

The founders of the great Republic have solved the political question and eliminated this element from the problem which we are now called upon to solve. Through their wisdom we have thus secured a government by the people and for the people, which has stood the test of foreign and civil war, shown its ability in dealing with the most complicated questions, and is about completing the first century of its existence. The nation now has to deal with the industrial problem. Struggling humanity awaits the action of the Great Republic, to see if, after giving man government on a Christian basis, it will give him industry on a Christian basis, and thus take the next great step in civilization.

The question presented by the present labor agitation is both industrial and social, and concerns, not the capitalist nor the wage receiver exclusively, nor the one more than the other, but the whole body of society and the State itself. It involves a great principle, in the presence of which individual interests become insignificant. No question more serious or of graver importance ever came before the American people, and upon its right settlement may not only depend the future of society, but ultimately the fate of the Great Republic.

It is not the part of wisdom to sit still and hope that social and industrial questions will adjust themselves without giving man any concern. Remedies only follow effort and preparation. We have advanced sufficiently under the inspiration of liberty and knowledge to know that our industrial system should be on a better basis, that strikes, violence, friction between employer and employed should cease, and, instead, there should be unity of interests, peace and harmony. In all reforms fair discussion and candid admission of the wrong has been the first, and conscientious effort to right it the next step. Reform and revolution begin with the people and never with rulers; rulers are contented with power and do not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

want a change. The propositions that all men are free and equal, that slavery is wrong, that one man is as good as another before the law, were all opposed, and those who advocated them were looked upon in their time as agitators, dreamers, doctrinaires. So will those be now regarded and resisted who advocate a better industrial system, by which labor shall have more of the wealth it produces. But in a popular government, where the preservation of the State depends upon the people, no person can fail who advocates making the people wiser and better. That teacher, that leader, and that political party in this government will have success, that is found on the side of the people, working to elevate them, and better their condition.

But the citizen should never be led to believe, and the rightly educated citizen will not believe, that the government can directly or indirectly relieve him from the necessity of labor as a means of support, or from the need of economy and self-denial, as the best possible provision for his own future, and for the future of those dependent upon him.

The ordinary remedies, such as forcible division of property, nationalization of land, socialism and communism as generally understood, furnish no relief for existing evils. If all property were equally divided among the people and there was no change in the industrial system, those that have the most now would probably get a still larger share soon after the division. The right to property legally acquired, under the existing system, ought never to be disturbed. The question is to secure better distribution in the future. The time for labor to get its fair share is not after wealth has been created and distributed, but at the time of its creation. There is not and there never can be too much wealth in the world. All the wealth is needed that the ability and power of individuals and corporations can legally produce.

Wealth honestly acquired stands for frugality, thrift, self-denial, personal effort, and personal sacrifice. Labor stands for quite as much, and is equally deserving. They are the greatest forces in civilization, without which it would perish. Both alike require and should have in an equal degree all the aid, encouragement and protection that the law or individuals can afford them. If capital is in distress, labor is in trouble ; if it leaves a country, labor also disappears. Injury to capital through individual or State action is hurtful to labor. Labor can never gain any advantage from the oppression of capital.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Society has grown away from a true appreciation of the dignity and importance of labor. Adam Smith has said: "Not by silver and gold, but by labor, was the wealth of the world purchased." There was a time when there was no capital; there never was a time during man's existence when there was no labor. In the beginnings of society, labor, as it is the real creator, receives all it produces, and the worker is treated with respect. In our complex civilization man could not exist without the fruits of labor. Everything that ministers to his wants, tastes, comfort and ease, is the result of labor. It is labor that gives him food, shelter and raiment, that transports him across continents and seas. "Labor wide as the earth has its summit in heaven."

Before any of the remedies offered for the solution of the industrial problem can avail, man and society must be made ripe through preparation, the preparation that comes from knowledge, wisdom, discipline and restraint, and the active work of the moral forces. The atoms composing the organism of society must be worked upon. Man individually must be made better and wiser, and selfishness conquered. Society grows only by slow degrees. We are in the infancy of the world. It is vain to hope for perfection at once—it is not to be expected. Something must be left for those who come after us. All this generation can hope to do is to begin the work at once, and if it takes one step in the right direction it will do well.

As a nation we are not without experience. A social and industrial question, in the early history of our country, took the form of slavery, and cast its shadow over our land, finally resting down in dense darkness over one-half of it. It grew noiselessly at first, but soon reached such dimensions that it not only threatened our national existence, but brought on the greatest war of modern times. To preserve the Union, the lives of nearly a million men were laid down and five thousand million dollars expended, while woe, misery and desolation were brought to unnumbered households throughout the land, particularly in the South. In the "red flame of war" slavery "went out," and four millions of chattels were raised from property to citizenship in the first Republic of the world. This was the greatest strain ever laid upon the government. It proved equal to the emergency, and society and civilization are better, and the government reaches nearer its ideal, for having been purged of the sin of slavery.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the South the negro, fresh from slavery, without lessons in political economy, soon discovered that the wage system brought him no return, and he at once demanded an interest in the crops his labor produced. The landowner, the capitalist, at first objected, thought the negro unreasonable but soon saw his way clear to grant the demand and take his former bondsman into partnership.

There is much for the capitalist to learn and do. He must learn the lesson that, as a matter of policy, it is safer and better to be just; that by agreeing to divide profits with the worker upon some plan, he may make more in the long run, and that competition, supply and demand are not the only laws that should govern the industrial world. He must learn that wealth is only a trust, and out of the abundance that has come to him he can afford to spare a portion of it in deeds of charity and philanthropy, and in helping the deserving poor and unfortunate. There is also much for the worker to learn. He must know that the way to aid himself is not through violence and coercion, but through obedience to law; that he can by proper effort do more to elevate himself and better his condition than can be done for him; that thrift, frugality, and economy are needed; that waste and intemperance are his worst enemies. The use of alcoholic drinks costs annually in the United States more than nine hundred millions of dollars, a sum that exceeds the combined annual earnings of all the railroads in the United States.

The object sought is not an ideal state where all will be equal in power, wisdom, goodness, position, wealth and influence. There will always be some to serve and some to lead. Absolute equality can no more exist in the social world, than all the peaks, mountains, hills and valleys can be reduced to a level in the physical world. The relief sought is not equality, but equity and justice. Some will always be wiser, better and stronger than others. Society, however, should be cast and formed on such lines that the good, wise and kind shall govern. Through the difficulties that environ the question, it is plain that some adjustment must be reached by which the war now raging between employer and employed, in the industrial world, must come to an end and be superseded by a system that will unite the interests of the employer and those of the employed. They must become and continue partners, instead of enemies, in the enterprises they operate. During the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process of the creation of wealth, there should be such a division between employer and employed, that the latter shall secure at least the three essentials of existence: food, clothing and shelter, and, in addition, means to subdue sickness, and by frugality and thrift, something over for the feebleness that grows as the years come on. He is entitled to this, and should have it. It is a modest and surely not an unreasonable demand. Nature has made provision for all her sons. This is an unanswerable reason why all who are worthy should have enough. The industrial system which does not permit the worthy to get enough is at fault. One of the greatest statesmen and orators of our times has said "wages are unjustly reduced, when an industrious man is not able by his earnings to live in comfort, educate his children, and lay by a sufficient amount for the necessities of age."

The methods which now seem to promise the best results in solving the industrial problem after knowledge becomes more general and society better prepared for their adoption, are—

Arbitration and conciliation.

Co-operation, and

Profit sharing.

Arbitration, as a method of settling differences between nations and individuals, has already made great triumphs and secured the best results; but is a preventive rather than a cure. It has already prevented some strikes and violence, and promises in the future to do well. When employer and employed can lay down their irritations and grievances sufficiently to meet as equals, and discuss frankly and candidly the disputed issues before a Board of Arbitration selected by both parties, it is a great step gained. The best fruits of arbitration and conciliation will only be gathered after education and intelligence become more general. It has been hindered by the want of these, and in the future, as progress in both is made, it is not too much to hope that arbitration and conciliation will be the means adopted alike by nations and by individuals, to adjust all differences.

Western civilization has entered upon a great industrial and social revolution, the outcome of which will be many radical social changes now looked upon as impracticable if not impossible. One of these changes will be the adoption of an industrial system in which the wage feature, as we now understand it, will largely disappear.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Society even now demands a better system, where antagonisms between employer and employed will disappear, where there will be less strife and more security, less disturbance and more repose, less selfishness and more charity.

Profit sharing based on industrial copartnership seems to furnish the best means of uniting the interests of employer and employed in agriculture, manufacturing and other large business enterprises. Profit sharing is not new in this or other countries; it has been adopted in agricultural industry in portions of some of the Southern and Western States, and is growing in favor. The two forces employed in transacting business and producing wealth, are labor and capital. The question is to unite these forces in a way that the interests of those controlling them shall be the same, and not hostile, as now. Constant war between employer and employed has brought great loss to both. Such war can be and ought to be superseded by their becoming partners, so that both shall have an interest in the business in hand. The interest need not be equal at first. As a basis, it has been suggested, the capitalist should have for the use of his capital a percentage of the amount he contributes, and as against this, the worker fair wages. Then, after paying all expenses, the profits should be divided between the capitalist on one side, and the body of workers, according to their earnings, on the other. In addition, each worker should have the right, by leaving with the working capital of the concern such part of his earnings or shares as he may choose, to become a partner in the ownership.

But it is said, this is all theory, all sentiment; the capitalist has not in the past been found ready for any such arrangement, and will not in the future agree to it. This is a natural objection, and there are others, all difficult to meet; else the great question would not give society such concern.

There is, however, this answer. Already some capitalists in various civilized countries, partly as a matter of self-interest, and partly to do good to their fellow-men, have entered into just such copartnerships with satisfactory results. Moreover, the past and the present are growing unlike. Conditions are constantly changing. New elements are entering into the question. One is, that the worker is to be armed with knowledge, which is power, and particularly the power of intelligent combination. Just as the capitalists combine to do their work more efficiently, so workers will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

combine to settle the terms upon which their labor shall be joined to capital for production.

There is an association in this country, composed of peaceable, honest, law-abiding and intelligent workers, who through their chief officer can, by a word, stop in a day all the locomotives on the trunk line railroads in the country. This is the power of combination, and where is there any other power equal to it? Without violence, and without violating any statute or principle of law, it can in a day paralyze the trade and commerce of a continent. How can it be resisted? The government has neither the right nor the power to resist it. Will any one undertake to say that such a power in the industrial world will not make itself felt in adjusting the interests between employer and employed? This power exists, is increasing, and must be considered in dealing with the industrial problem.

There is another element even more irresistible. It is the power of public opinion, which is reaching the conclusion that the laws of competition, supply and demand, as applied to the wage-receiver, operate unjustly; that the worker does not now, in many cases, get a fair share of what he helps to produce; that he is in effect a partner with the capitalist, though not treated as such. It is to be further considered, that the worker, who heretofore has had little to say, is helping now, through education, to make this public opinion, which in the end must stand as the sole judge and final arbiter of what is just and fair between him and the capitalist. In view of these new conditions, and for other reasons, the capitalist should seriously consider the best plan of uniting his interest with that of the wage-receiver. In admitting the principle of co-partnership, would he not make, in the way of increased profits, nearly if not all that he would be called upon to concede? The worker, having a direct interest, would do more and better work. The saving, by better care of property, tools and machinery, and by diminution in the cost of superintendence, would in the aggregate afford a large return to increase the profits. With co-partnership between employer and employed, the worker would feel he was more nearly the equal of the capitalist, his pride and ambition would be stimulated to better action, and the sense of inferiority he is made to feel by having no interest in the business would largely disappear. Unity of interest would prevent strikes, and the loss of time and wages, and the destruction of property incident to them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mazzini said:

"Every political question is rapidly becoming a social question, and every social question a religious question."

The aggressive civilization of to-day, the one that will conquer the world and supersede all others, the one that has proved the best for man, and that has lifted him up to higher plains than any other, is that built upon and shaped by the teachings of Christ. The best thoughts of all the best thinkers and writers upon the industrial problem have found nothing equal to the words, "love thy neighbor as thyself," "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." All correct philosophy, all sound teaching and reasoning, conduct us unerringly to these simple truths, which combine in themselves every essential principle necessary to the solution of the industrial problem. A solution based upon these would abide, because it would be founded on simple justice between man and man.

S. B. ELKINS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

JOINT RESOLUTION :—Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas the first President of the United States was not inaugurated until the thirtieth day of April, in the year seventeen hundred and eighty-nine ; and

Whereas the day which was chosen by the Continental Congress for the installation of the new Government then established by the Constitution, the fourth day of March, does now cause a public inconvenience in unduly curtailing and limiting the second session of every Congress ; and

Whereas it is fitting that the one hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States be commemorated by the inauguration of his successor in eighteen hundred and eighty-nine upon the same day, and that this should be the day, hereafter, for the beginning of successive administrations of the Government ; therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as part of the Constitution, namely :

Article XVI.

The term of office of the President and the second session of the Fiftieth Congress shall continue until the thirtieth day of April in the year eighteen hundred and eighty-nine; and the thirtieth of April shall thereafter be substituted for the fourth of March as the commencement of the official term of the successive Presidents, Vice-Presidents and Congresses of the United States.

This preamble and joint resolution was prepared by Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, and Judge Nott, of the Court of Claims, who first advanced the idea of changing the date of the inauguration of the President. At the suggestion of Hon. Horatio King, I introduced it in the Senate, March 15th, and, on the 3d inst., it was favorably reported by Senator Hoar from the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Should it be adopted by two-thirds of both Houses, and ratified by the Legislatures of thirty States before March 4, 1889, it will be valid as part of the Constitution.

The selection of March 4th as the original date for the initiation of the Congressional and Presidential terms was arbitrary. The Constitution only declared their duration, but, after New Hampshire, the ninth State, ratified that instrument, June 21, 1788, the Congress of the Confederation passed an act nam-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing New York as the place, and the first Wednesday of the following March as the day, for setting the new government in operation. Owing to lack of facilities for travel, and the indifference of the people, a quorum of the two Houses was not obtained till April 6th, to count the electoral votes. Further time was consumed in arranging the forms and methods of the ceremony, so that the oath of office was not administered to President Washington till April 30, 1789.

But the 4th of March remained as the initial period, and the terms being fixed by the Constitution, the date can only be changed by amendment and not by law.

The human mind is pleased with anniversaries, and the proposed change appeals to the imagination with much force, as suggested in the preamble; but there are many substantial reasons for its adoption. It will diminish the interregnum of nine months, between March 4th and the first Monday in December, during which Congress is not organized.

It will also add two months to the closing session of every Congress, which now ends March 4th, crowding all the business of each alternate year into about seventy days, with great detriment both to the character and the amount of legislation.

It will give a longer interval for the subsidence of popular excitement after each Presidential election and afford the President greater opportunity for recovery from the fatigues of the campaign, for deliberation in the selection of his Cabinet, and the determination of his policy.

It will contribute largely to the public health, comfort, convenience and pleasure. The inauguration of our Presidents is the national occasion for imposing pageantry, parade and demonstration. The tendency to display increases with our population and with the enlarged facilities for reaching the Capital. It has valuable uses and should be encouraged. For these purposes no time could be so unfavorable as the 4th of March in Washington. It is neither winter nor spring. The weather is usually inclement, blustering and harsh. It is said that President Harrison died from cold contracted by exposure on the day he was inaugurated. Those who remember General Grant, as he stood bareheaded on the eastern portico on the 4th of March, 1873, delivering his second inaugural in a furious northern blast, with the temperature nearly at zero, will need no other argument for the change of date. Hayes and Garfield were not much more fortunate. Cleveland happened to have a sunny, vernal day, but it was the only one of the entire season. The 30th of April finds spring well advanced in this latitude, and the landscape wears its most entrancing aspect. The tumultuous splendors of inauguration at this season would find an appropriate counterpart in the exalting glories of the advancing year.

The only objection thus far urged against the amendment is that it will give two additional months of power to the present administration. Whether this argument will appeal most strongly to democrats or republicans does not yet appear. The President seems to be regarded with equal indifference by his friends and by his enemies.

JOHN J. INGALLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

If a maker of dainty little Dresden China figures were to climb to the house-top, once a month, and pompously make proclamation that his art surpassed in value that of the Greeks, and that the day of the Venus of Milo and of the Elgin marbles had passed, and that the age demanded a finer art, he would excite wild hilarity, and would be laughed at as a fanatic or a lunatic.

Yet such a spectacle would be no more ludicrous than that which is presented once a month by Mr. W. D. Howells, when he, a writer of *bric-à-brac* social studies, sneers at such masters of the art of fiction as Scott, Thackeray, Hawthorne, Dickens and Balzac. What a fellow-feeling Mr. Howells would have for him, if, from his lofty perch in the Study, he should see the little image-maker, and should hear him railing at Phidias, Praxiteles, and Michael Angelo! But there is little likelihood that our author would discern the diminutive, noisy iconoclast. For the curtains are closely drawn. We know this because he has taken us there. He has told us that the view from his Study windows is all comprehensive, and invited us to enter and look over the prospect and chat with him about authors and books, and the literary tendencies of the times. We hoped and expected, from the form of his invitation, to find him, telescope in hand, ready to take a broad, whole-souled, generous, hearty view of all that was good in literature the world over. What did we find? The heavy curtains shut out the warm, genial sunlight. A single small stick blazed feebly on the hearth, adding, by its mockery, to the chill of the room. The air was laden with the perfume of incense brought by pilgrims from Boston, the echoes of whose words of flattery still lingered in the corners of the book-cases. The atmosphere, to one coming from the bracing winds outside, was enervating. But not so with our host; he has waxed fat and grown rich upon it. We found him with a strong magnifying-glass, instead of a telescope, in hand, and he was examining, with eagerness and with a critical eye, something which he had imprisoned beneath a watch crystal on the smooth surface of the inlaid table. When asked what it was that he was gazing at so intently, he replied that he had beneath the glass the "mind of a society girl;" he had discovered sixteen conflicting emotions regarding the sort of a dress she should wear at the ball (in his novel, of course,) that evening, and he was searching for the seventeenth with all the excitement with which Galileo searched for the satellites of Jupiter.

The languid voice of the St. Botolph clubman is heard, however, in faint protest, that we are drawing a portrait of an imaginary Mr. Howells, not of the real Mr. Howells. The picture, as a matter of fact, is under, rather than over-drawn. That this is so, may be safely left to the judgment of intelligent men, who, in considering the scope and drift of Mr. Howells' criticisms, are not prevented by personal friendship from deducing honest conclusions from plain statements. Mr. Howells, announced a few years ago, that the art of fiction had become a finer art in our day than it was with Dickens and Thackeray, and that "we could not suffer the confidential attitude of the *latter* now, nor the mannerism of the *former*." Latterly, however, he has expounded his theory of fiction more fully. He declares that heroes and heroines are "abnormal beings," "barbaric survivals;" that the old romantic ideals are false; that the real

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sacrifices of life have been offered for races, not for persons; that there is no such thing as genius as distinguished, presumably, from the talent by which a man, working from nine A. M. till one P. M., six days in the week, is able, year in and year out, to follow one serial story with another without a break; that "human feelings as God made them and as men know them," however vapid, fine-spun and wearisome, are good enough for novel-readers; that there need be no incident in a story, and neither more plot nor less than there is in the experience of God's creatures generally; and that the day is passed for verifying the externals of life, and for portraying the outside of men and things. Mr. Howells argues, in effect, that the truth as it is exemplified in "Daisy Miller," in "A Woman's Reason," in "Mark Rutherford," and in "Indian Summer," is so vastly superior in point of contemporaneous human interest to the truth as it was in those shallow fellows who could not penetrate below the surface of things—Scott, Thackeray, Dickens, Balzac, and (Heaven save the mark!) Hawthorne—that presently the critics will come to see the inferiority of the old and the rare excellence of the new; and then "all will have been changed!"

Was the note of inordinate, exasperating egotism ever struck so fairly and so loudly by any other son of Ohio—that mother of great and self-all-sufficient men? The air of superciliousness and self-satisfaction with which Mr. Howells makes such dogmatic assertions, praising and advertising himself, as witness the Stedman episode, and sneering at authors whose books will be read with eagerness and pleasure when his are covered with the dust of years, is becoming fairly nauseating. He may not know it, but the fact is that thousands who have been unknown friends of his have been disgusted with his arrogant, conceited tone as a critic. If, as apparently is the case, his modesty and good-breeding in the discussion of literary questions are leaving him, common sense ought to teach him that he can ill afford to lose the sympathy and good-will of his audience by going out of his way to deride the masters of the art of fiction. Mr. Howells has made many friends by his writings. His light and airy sketches, delicately shaded and wrought out with the greatest skill, will have their place, for a time, in literature. No writer has shown a cleverness equal to his in investing the commonplaces and frivolities of life with a certain indefinite, vague, elusive charm. None has been able to reproduce so accurately and to dress in such a perfect literary style the random, insipid gossip of a "Five o'clock." None has given us a more refined picture of the skim-milk-and-water passions and inconsequential motives that shape the conduct, from day to day, of the sentimental, vacillating society girl or of the back-boneless young man, who "drifts" aimlessly and wearily in and out of the story. His creations, or, to speak more accurately, his note-book characters, exert themselves to glorify the commonplaces of every-day life. Others may take pleasure in Mr. Howells' pages, but, from the very necessity of things, commonplace people he wholly satisfies. They see themselves in his characters, and feel flattered by the choice that the author has made. Their lives consist of uninteresting trivialities. No unwelcome, disturbing "incident" ever gains entrance to their drawing-rooms. Indeed, they were shocked when the carriage went over the wall and Colville "felt himself whirled into the air and then swung ruining down into the writhing and crashing heap at the bottom of the wall."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They knew well whom Mr. Howells learned that poor business of, and hoped he would never descend to such a vulgar device again. Their thoughts flow in shallow, endless channels. Their range of vision is bounded by portières and Japanese screens. They are taught that to become emotional or enthusiastic over anything is "bad form." They are not troubled with any high moral ideas or with any old-fashioned, romantic notions about love. "Business is business" with them, as with Belinda in the play. They shudder at the thought of doing anything that shall cause them to be regarded as heroes or heroines, and have no desire to sacrifice themselves, except, perchance, for the salvation of the African or Indian race.

Over such people Mr. Howells' influence is boundless; with them his word is law. But as the proclaimer of a new truth, as the advocate of a new theory of fiction, his ambition ought to be to win converts to his way of thinking. A show, even if the real thing were wanting, of modesty, temperance and generosity in his treatment of authors to whom the world has given the highest praise, would have been becoming and would have helped his cause. For some of us have a pretty store of prejudices in favor of the writers to whom Mr. Howells refers in tones of lofty contempt, and many of us are acquiring a pretty store of grudges against the man whose presumption will not allow him to recognize these prejudices as having any good reason for being. It is only with the greatest difficulty that one can believe that so intelligent a man as Mr. Howells honestly holds such opinions as he advances. If he is honest in it, the only explanation of his extraordinary course is that his success and the feminine flattery of Boston have so warped his mind that he cannot bring to the discussion of fiction and writers of fiction that disinterestedness which is the essential element of criticism of real and permanent value—criticism founded upon truth and clearness of intellectual vision. If he is not honest—if his astonishing propositions are made with a consciousness of their absurdity and of the offense that they will give, merely for the purpose of exciting controversy and in order to attract attention to himself and his books—if, in other words, it is the purely commercial spirit that animates him, no condemnation can be too severe for such an abuse of power. As he must be either honest or dishonest, we leave to his friends the task of deciding which horn of the dilemma will pain him and them the least.

The most important aspect of this question remains to be considered, and that is the probable moral effect of the teachings of Mr. Howells upon the young people of the country whose literary tastes are being formed. His influence for good or evil is wide. His words reach probably a million readers every month. He has been accepted in many quarters as the leading literary authority of America, and his opinions, if uncontradicted, may be expected to carry great weight. Thus far the protests against the doctrines which he sets forth have been, in the main, feeble and fragmentary. The presumption and tone of authority which he has assumed seem to have had a paralyzing effect on public opinion. His audacity and assurance have been stupefying, but the time has come for a most emphatic word of protest against the acceptance of the standard which he sets up. American character is flabby enough now; Mr. Howells would make it flabbier still. Courage, independence, manliness, hero-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism and a spirit of self-sacrifice are qualities that he never gives his characters, and that he sneers at as antiquated or obsolete in his essays. Is he to be allowed to tell the youth of America, without fear of contradiction, that the day of Ivanhoe, of Henry Esmond, of Sydney Carton, and of Leatherstocking, is passed, and that the ideals which these names represent, of honor, chivalry, bravery, generosity and self-reliance belong to a former age and are not suited to the present time? Does Mr. Howells' theory of heroism and self-sacrifice furnish as high a moral standard for the government of conduct as does the wonderful story of the unselfishness and the devotion to each other, amid suffering and death, which Greely's men showed at Cape Sabine? Is his theory sustained or disproved by the facts? Can Mr. Howells, with his recollection of how tenderly these brave men cared for poor Elison for months, and with a picture in his mind's eye of Frederick's devotion to the dying hero Rice, maintain with truth that self-sacrifice is nowadays made for races, not for individuals? Is he to be permitted to tell American girls that the truth as it is in Bessie Alden, in Irene and Penelope Lapham, in Verena Tarrant, in Imogene Graham and in Mrs. Bowen, is to supersede the truth as it is in Rebecca, in Amy Robsart, in Ethel Newcome, in Agnes Wickfield, and in Hester Prynne? Can the effect of such teaching upon the youth of the country be aught but pernicious? Will not its tendency be to offer polite imbecility as a worthy substitute for true nobility of character? And does not the manner in which Mr. Howells is exerting his influence to this deplorable end remind one of a passage in Thackeray's sarcastic chapter on literary snobs? "You *may*, occasionally, it is true," says the satirist, "hear one literary man abusing his brother; but why? Not in the least out of malice; not at all from envy; merely from a sense of truth and public duty."

JESSE COOLIDGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED